

4225. 10

R E M A R K S
ON A LATE PUBLICATION,
INTITLED,
"A SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION
"OF THE ARGUMENTS
"AGAINST THE ONE GODHEAD
"OF THE
"FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST."
"PRODUCED BY
"THE REVEREND MR. LINDSEY,
"IN HIS LATE APOLOGY.
"BY A LAYMAN."
IN AN ADDRESS TO THE AUTHOR.
BY A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

"THERE IS BUT ONE GOD THE FATHER.
"ST. PAUL. 1 COR. viii. 6."

THE SECOND EDITION,
WITH LARGE ADDENDA, AND A LETTER
TO THE
REV. MR. JOSEPH FISHER, OF DRAX.

Y O R K:
PRINTED BY C. ETHERINGTON,
FOR
JOHN BELL, No. 132, IN THE STRAND,
L O N D O N.
MDCC LXXV.
[PRICE THREE SHILLINGS.]



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Remarks were already in the press, when the Remarker first saw the second edition of the *Scriptural Confutation* advertised; it was therefore out of his power to take any notice of that, as otherwise he certainly would, if any material alterations have been made. All he can now do, is to inform the public that these Remarks relate solely to the first edition.

If Mr. Burgh has corrected any of his numberless sophisms, and astonishing perversions of Scripture, it will give the greater pleasure to his opponent, the more numerous such corrections are; and indeed Mr. Burgh himself will, in the same proportion, become a more respectable adversary.

As his book made its first appearance, it was a most crude performance; though

ADVERTISEMENT.

men, whose prejudices co-incide with his own, have cried it up exceedingly. One would suppose, however, that none but such, could possibly find any thing to commend in a writer, whose whole reasoning is most illogical, and who, to serve his hypothesis, has availed himself, through his whole book, of ambiguous and erroneous translations of the Scriptures, even where the smallest attention to the original must have given a very different view.

Many instances of both kinds will be found pointed out in the following remarks, and many more were left unnoticed, for a reason given in its proper place. Of these latter the reader is intreated to pardon the mention of one, so extraordinary, that one would hope cooler consideration has excluded it from the new edition. It will be found at page 134 of his book, where he quotes St. Paul's charge to Timothy.

“ I give

ADVERTISEMENT.

“ I give thee charge in the sight of God,
 “ who quickeneth all things, and before
 “ Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate
 “ witnessed a good confession, that thou
 “ keep this commandment without spot,
 “ unrebukeable, until the appearing of
 “ our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his
 “ times he shall shew, who is the blessed
 “ and only Potentate, the King of Kings,
 “ and Lord of Lords; who only hath im-
 “ mortality, dwelling in the light, which
 “ no man can approach unto, whom no
 “ man hath seen nor can see. 1 Tim. vi.
 “ 13, 14, 15.”

It was barely possible for a mere En-
 glish reader to refer the personal pronoun
he to the preceding words Christ Jesus;
 and then the relative *who*, which follows,
 would point *him* out as the blessed and *only*
 Potentate, *who only* hath immortality and
 dwelleth in the light which no man can
 approach unto; and then “ the glory of
 “ God unapproachable by man is ascribed
 “ to Jesus Christ, and his (Supreme) God-
 “ head is incontrovertibly established.”

This

ADVERTISEMENT.

This was an advantage, which a disputant in distress was not to despise, and accordingly our *Confuter* snapped at it with the blind eagerness of an hungry fish, and has hooked himself so effectually, that all the tricks of sophistry, and all the powers of logic will never disengage him.

Let us suppose him to be right in his interpretation. Then he, who is the *only* Potentate, and who *only* hath immortality, is Jesus Christ personally distinguished from the Father, and from the Holy Ghost: For if Jesus Christ is not a personal name, it is impossible to conceive it to have any use at all. What then? Why, then neither the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, can personally be a Potentate, nor personally possess immortality, in so eminent a degree at least, as Jesus Christ, who is personally the *only* Potentate, and *alone* personally possesses immortality. This consequence cannot be avoided, except the *Confuter* will directly own himself a Sabellian, an Heretic of so absurd

ADVERTISEMENT.

furd tenets, that the learned Dr. Tucker seems to think it impossible for any such to exist in this enlightened age; and this again is not reconcileable with what he says about Octavius, Lepidus, and Anthony,

He who quotes Greek ought to have known, that there is no ambiguity in the original, but that two different persons are marked in the strongest manner, so strongly, that the attributes of the one cannot be the attributes of the other. In that there is no *he*, no *who*, which led our willing captive into so fatal a difficulty. *Keep*, says St. Paul, *this commandment—unrebukeable until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in his own times the blessed and ONLY Potentate shall shew, (bring to pass) the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, He, who ONLY hath immortality.* Here, and not before, *he* and *who* have any thing to do. The *only* Potentate, *He*, who *only* hath immortality, is to bring to pass the manifestation of our Lord Jesus Christ. This is an unaccountable manner of expression.

ADVERTISEMENT.

pression, if Jesus Christ is to bring about his own manifestation; and if he is not, the word only, twice repeated, excludes *him*, and all other beings in the universe, from those great privileges thus appropriated to the one super-eminent Personage.

To what can it be imputed, that this writer so strangely abuses his own and his reader's understanding? O Bigotry, great are thy powers! Thou hast prompted him to say, that "the God of truth is "a dupe to his own artifices," if revelation teach not, what the *Confuter* thinks it ought; and we may say, it is hoped without *impiety*, that himself is the *dupe* of his own Enthusiasm.

PREFACE.

P R E F A C E.

THE Author of the Scriptural Confutation calls himself a "Young Man." * This is, perhaps, the best excuse that can be made for that strange rhapsody which he has thrown together under the denomination of a Book; and I can readily believe this testimony of himself: For his work bears all the marks of an understanding yet very imperfectly matured. It may therefore be the fault of his age, more than of the man, that he engaged so forwardly in an undertaking, for which he is altogether unfit. Young men have not always that modesty, which of all qualities most becomes them, and the want of which sometimes throws them into the most awkward and distressing situations; and so it has happened in this particular case.

* Page 223.

Our young man has undertaken to give a Scriptural demonstration of a Trinity of equal Persons in the Godhead, that three Persons equally and individually God, are all three but one and the same God; yet does he at the same time grant that no such proposition is contained in the whole Bible *, that at most it is but hinted at, even where the greatest light is afforded, and referred to as a matter already known. But who knows not that hints are liable to be mistaken, and that we who live in an age so distant from that of the Apostles, can by no means know what they taught, but from what they have left us written? The taking it for granted, therefore, that the first Preachers of the Gospel taught the "Divinity of our blessed Lord," that is, his Supreme Godhead, to their respective converts, is taking for granted the very thing that ought to be proved.

Let us however see what he says. This proposition is not in the Books of the Old Testament, because the prophecies relating to Jesus Christ are there but obscurely expressed: It is not in the four Gospels, because they contain only the history of what Jesus did, while he was resident upon earth, and this was a doctrine improper for that time,

* Page 43 compared with 187, &c. See the whole second chapter.

and not to be revealed till after his ascent into heaven: It is not to be found in the Acts of the Apostles; for he gives up that Book except one text, which I have proved to be utterly impertinent to his purpose as it stands, and still more, in all probability a corrupted reading. There remains, therefore, only the Apostolical Epistles, and the Revelation of St. John. The Epistles contain no such proposition, he says, because they were written to churches and persons already instructed in the great mystery of a Trinity, and it was unnecessary to teach them over again what they well knew; it was sufficient to refer to it in general terms. From the Revelation he has not offered to produce a single text, that directly teaches any such mystery, and therefore gives up that Book among the rest.

This, I think, he will not deny to be, in few words, a fair representation of what he has said; and if it be, how will he be able to furnish out so strict a demonstration of that, which at best is, by his own concession, but alluded to? Will it not be necessary to prove the reality of the allusion, before it can be assumed as a foundation to ground a strict mathematical conclusion upon? People may fancy references and allusions, which never entered a writer's mind, and I know no one more likely
to

to be deluded by fancy than a person of so very impetuous zeal as appears in the performance in question.

Where supposition is so freely indulged, one may, on the other side, venture to suppose, that, if the doctrine he espouses were so necessary, as he would have it understood to be, to the existence of a true Church, the Jews, in whose Scriptures it is not explicitly contained, where, as himself allows, it was impossible for them to find it, could not have been true worshippers of God, and consequently theirs not altogether a true church; in which case it would seem that God had indulged them with a revelation, that, for their own particular, stood them in no great stead.

This, however, is incredible; and it is still more incredible that our Saviour himself should communicate, as we know he did, with a church that worshipped God erroneously, and never make one attempt to rectify the error: But it seems, it would have been utterly improper for him to impart to them any information of that sort; because, if they had known him to be the Supreme God, they would not have put him to death, and so his satisfaction to the Father's justice, and the redemption of the world, would have been prevented. Is it then credible, or indeed is it possible, that they
who

P R E F A C E. v

who would not believe him, when he assured them, by the most miraculous powers, that he was the messenger of God, would have believed him, if he had told them, what was infinitely more incredible, that he was the Supreme God himself? Such a declaration would have insured his crucifixion much more effectually: For if they considered it as so capital blasphemy to call himself the Son of God, certainly it must have appeared to be blasphemy of the most aggravated kind, if he had said that he was God himself; that God, whom they knew from their own Scriptures to be absolutely invisible. Thus Jesus Christ, according to this young man's theology, came into this world to teach true religion, and went out of it, leaving mankind at an utter loss with respect to the first and most fundamental principle of it, having, while he was in the world, countenanced error by his own example.

Was this matter, therefore, set right by the Apostles and inspired writers after him? Not so far as we know, except we take this gentleman's word, that they taught Athanasianism verbally, where they planted the Gospel, and thought it sufficient to hint at, or allude to it in their writings, which were composed for the instruction of all ages to come. This he says, and reduces us thereby to an evil situation indeed; for we have nothing to depend on but uncertain tradition, for the great,
the

the distinguishing doctrine of Christianity, that awful particular of the faith, which, "whosoever" would be saved, must keep whole and undivided." If the Apostles were so negligent in this capital and characteristic principle of Gospel-religion, what assurance can we have that they were not equally negligent in other points of less moment; and then how can we be certain that we have the religion taught by Christ and his Apostles in any degree of purity? May we not still be in nearly as bad a state, as before Christ's coming to eradicate error, and teach the true, the whole will of God? I can see no succedaneum for the diligence and accuracy of the sacred writers, but oral tradition; and at that opening Popery will enter with might and main, and lead us all in captivity to the Bishop of Rome, and chain us for ever to his foot-stool. We shall in vain alledge our sixth article for the sufficiency of Scripture to salvation, because here is a direct confession, that, from the want of care, and indifference of the writers, the Scriptures are exceedingly deficient.

What a pity, that this thoughtless youth did not consult some friend of maturer judgment; or if he did, that his seasonable advice was over-ruled by his own self-sufficiency? If he had no friend of this kind to consult, there are considerations, which even a giddy mind could hardly fail to suggest,

gest, that ought to have deterred him from the attempt of confuting the Apology. The honour of the establishment was in question; the foundations of the church, as a scriptural church, which reprobates every doctrine not taken immediately from the Bible, were struck at; and, in the opinion of some people, a breach was made. Was it for a Stripling to stand forth a volunteer in the day of danger, and brandish his unassayed armour? The Veterans of Orthodoxy were called for, and no doubt were bringing up their artillery; but disgusted by the alacrity of an interloper, or glad of a pretence to be excused from a service, which they knew would require their utmost exertion, they stopped short, and left the Apologist to the triumph of one, who shouted victory before he had made the smallest impression on the object of his attack.

Hence the conscientious *Seceder* has the honour to be yet in safe possession of his principles, and the church, from which he *seceded*, lies under, perhaps, the unmerited disgrace of being incapable of defence. Hence it happens, that his self-delegated assailant, to whom unsubstantial vapours floating in his brain are reasons, “strong as proofs of “holy writ,” boasts, that this nonsensical proposition, “that Jesus Christ is one with the Father, “God,” has been demonstrated by him, from

b

holy

holy Scripture, “ *as* clearly as any proposition in “ the mathematical elements of Euclid *.” With this boast in his mouth, he acknowledges, that in one part of Scripture it was impossible for those, who were most concerned, to find it ; that in another it was improper to be revealed ; that where the evidence is greatest, the fact is only presumed by himself, not affirmed by the writers. Of such materials, he tells us, his mathematical demonstration is composed. Men of ordinary understanding, and cooler heads, will be at a loss to know, how a sort of certainty should be in the conclusion, which is absent from all the premises. But there are men of whom it is truly said, *quisquid volunt, credunt*, and these men never meet with a difficulty in their speculations, but they put it to flight with the greatest facility.

We are told, indeed, that this demonstration is not deducible from any particular part of Scripture, but results from the whole of it collectively. If in the later books of Scripture there had been but a single text, expressly affirming that “ Jesus “ Christ is one with the Father, God,” that three equal persons are one God, this might have been a kind of pole-star to direct our inquiries, and it might reasonably have been presumed that all the

* Page 192.

rest pointed to it; but this not being the case, no man has a right to assume for the sense of the Holy Spirit, that which the Holy Spirit himself does not acknowledge. But notwithstanding his own declaration, that this mathematical demonstration results only from "the whole Bible," and from "nothing less than the whole Bible," our extraordinary Logician, in direct contradiction to what he here says, has attempted to deduce the same conclusion from several scores of separate texts, in every part of Scripture, and insisted, in language the most peremptory, that he has so deduced it. How he has succeeded in this attempt, will be seen in the following sheets,

But before we turn to them, I must beg leave to introduce another curious conceit, which did not fall within my plan to be so fully noticed elsewhere. Though there was no absolute necessity for using the terms "Trinity, and Trinity in Unity," to express the mystery of the Godhead, there was, it seems, a sort of necessity of convenience, "to serve the purpose of more expeditiously conveying one's mind on the subject *." But why should men be in more haste to convey their ideas, than the Sacred Writers, who composed the books of Scripture, or the Holy Spirit, who suggested the

* Page 9.

matter? If their mind could be expeditiously enough conveyed, without these barbarous and scholastic terms, is this either more or less than telling them, that too much of the important time of such consequential gentlemen as our Layman, would be taken up by following them in their round-about track?

A modest man would have been extremely cautious of saying this, if it were but out of reverence of the Holy Spirit, who did not think his time misemployed in delivering his message as he received it from God; but there is another consideration still more urgent for this caution, and that is, that possibly the terms may not be exactly synonymous with the words of the Holy Spirit, that is, convey precisely the meaning he intended. There is, indeed, great reason to suspect they do not; nay it may seem to be a certainty that they do not clearly convey it, if one may venture to conclude only from that strife, contention, bloodshed, and utter extirpation of brotherly love, which the introduction of these terms, from their very first invention, occasioned in the Christian world, and which subsist, on the very same account, in different countries, in different degrees, to this day.

No believer ever doubted, that, what the Scriptures expressly affirm of the person and nature of
God,

God, was true; but thousands and ten thousands of pious and serious believers have entered their protest against this artificial theology, and sealed their testimony by their blood, which at least afforded an irrefragable proof of their sincerity. Thus were Christians divided into furious factions, and destroyed one another with the ferocity of Barbarians.

This could hardly have happened (for I insist not here on the absolute falsity of the Layman's proposition) if the mind and will of God had been so evident on his side of the question, as it ought to have been to justify the introduction of a new expression of man's device. And, if the chance was ever so little, as indeed it was very great, that the new-invented terms might imply some deviation from the meaning of the Holy Spirit, in the same proportion was the danger, that he, who should enforce the acceptance of them by human penalties, would become a preacher of *another Gospel*, and subject himself to the curse denounced by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. He therefore, who will venture on such an expedient for propagating his own interpretations, ought to feel the strongest conviction of mind, that he cannot be mistaken.

God

God, who gave the faculties of one man, gave those of another also; and has no where said, that your understanding should be in bondage to mine, nor mine to your's. On the contrary every man is commanded to examine for himself, to obey God rather than man, and *is to stand or fall to his own master*. And surely that is the will of God to me, which I find to be so, by the best exercise I can make of the understanding, which God has given me. It is necessary to salvation that I be fully persuaded in my own mind, and it will not excuse me, who am accountable for the employment of my own talents, that I suffer another, who has no such authority from God, to obtrude on me his own, perhaps erroneous, persuasion,

What assurance, indeed, can any man have, that another has not examined the Holy Scriptures with as much impartiality and attention as himself? And shall he then turn downright Inquisitor, and condemn his brother for not receiving his interpretation; which if he do receive, he must be condemned of God, who hath commanded him to search the Scriptures for himself, and to be finally determined by what he shall find there written? Equal diligence and equal capacity being supposed, is not one man as liable to mistake as another? And in this case, will not the probability be in favour of him, who has the fewest and weakest temptations

temptations to bias his judgment, and influence his conclusions?

It will be hard perhaps to conceive any temptations of this kind in those, who determine on the unpopular side, and consequently relinquish all hopes of temporal encouragements, or advantages. If there are men, who not only suspect, but even think they see with certainty the falsity of certain metaphysical propositions, it would appear, even without examining the weight of Scripture-evidence in the opposite scale, to have been wrong to establish them, and thereby fix terms of communion, which the Scriptures have not fixed. They who maintain such propositions have a right to abound in their own sense, and of this they will not be deprived, if our ecclesiastical constitution should be once more brought back to the true principles of Protestantism, and settled on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets.

But we are told, that it was as free, and as harmless to invent and to use the terms Trinity, and Trinity in Unity *, as for the converts at Antioch to give themselves the new name of Christians. This appellation was intended to explain, and did explain, no doctrine of faith or practice;

* Page 10.

can the same be said of the terms "Trinity, and Trinity in Unity?" If not, is not our Layman's illustration wholly impertinent? The Apostles certainly either would not have given their sanction to a new term of such importance, introduced by private Christians, or if they had, such sanction would have proved its propriety. This is not the case with the terms in question, and seeing the sanction is wholly human, and the Church did well without them for near two hundred years, it may do as well without them at this day, except the Christianity of modern times is not the Christianity of antiquity.

But it seems, if we exclude these mysterious terms, we shall want words to express the great *mystery* of the Faith, and there are men to whom religion without mystery would be a strange phenomenon. To me, however, it would be a stranger, if there should be any mystery in a religion, which the God of all wisdom sent his Son to reveal, who likewise sent the Holy Spirit to his immediate successors, to lead them into all truth, from whom we have genuine records of all the doctrines of the one, and all the suggestions of the other. I could wish this warm Young Man to read a few pages of a late excellent publication, where he would find the meaning of the word *Mystery* in the New Testament clearly explained.

I would

P R E F A C E. xv

I would name the book, but he has so strong an antipathy to the title, that it might possibly set him in a blaze, and I wish him to go coolly to the consideration of the following Remarks. I will, however, venture to quote the Author's conclusion, as it follows from the fairest premises. "From
 " all which it appears, that the word *Mystery* in
 " the New Testament, means nothing more than
 " a *secret*; or a thing not understood. And in the
 " same manner, as the word *secret* is still made
 " use of, after it is divulged; (as when we say the
 " *secret* is well known;) so the word *Mystery* is
 " used to signify the doctrines of the Gospel, even
 " after they had been publickly taught and ex-
 " plained, and consequently, if we must not
 " search into Mysteries, we must not endeavour
 " to understand the Gospel." To these words I shall only add those of the late amiable Foster, as fully expressing my own sentiments, "Where
 " *Mystery* begins, *Religion* ends."

e REMARKS,

REMARKS, &c.

S I R,

THE extraordinary reputation which your book speedily obtained with readers of a particular complexion, raised in me a great curiosity to see what new light could be thrown on a subject which had so long employed the pens of the ablest orthodox Divines, and which after all, appeared to me to be left in a state of the greatest perplexity. The Layman, it was said, had removed all doubts, and given, from the Scriptures, a perfect demonstration of the truth of Athanasianism. I took up your work therefore with much prejudice in its favour; and though I did not hope to find, what was so much boasted of, demonstration, yet I expected much ingenuity of argument and criticism. I expected to see texts judiciously selected and compared, the context candidly examined, and some plausibility at least in the conclusion. But, alas, how was I disappointed, when I found the contrary of all this; the Scriptures miserably garbled, texts strung together that

B

have

have no relation to each other, principles taken for granted that ought to have been proved, and proofs founded solely on false translations, and false grammar!

I am willing to believe you to be serious, and you have certainly shewn your zeal: but probably the good woman *, who nursed you, and gave you the first information on this subject, had as much zeal as yourself, and some people may suspect as much knowledge; at least she gave you as good a proof as any you have produced, after all your labour and parade, "that Jesus Christ is with the Father, one God †."

In order to clear the way for the sort of proof you intended to bring, you have taken the trouble to write a chapter "on the province of reason, with respect to its enquiry into Scripture truths." Here, Sir, it must be acknowledged that you have shewn a prudent foresight of that which was to follow: For, before that which proves nothing, can be admitted as a proof of something, reason must be set aside, and the human mind left destitute of all principles, of every faculty which ought to regulate its judgment and conclusions. Persuade men once that they have no means of distinguishing

* Page 199.

† Page 15.

truth from falshood, that they are utterly helpless in so important a case, and they will thankfully take your nurse's word † if she inform them that fire is cold, snow hot, and grass yellow. If however I had been of your counsel, I would have advised you for the sake of truth, to have spared that pains, and to have given your readers Mr. Locke's chapter on much the same subject: It would have made an odd contrast indeed with your following chapters, but you have not scrupled to distinguish your performance with as great inconsistencies; and, with regard to your readers, it might have made some of them understand, that they have a right to be treated as reasonable creatures, and that absurdity, even in matters of religion, is not capable of proof.

This chapter is laboured in so high a strain of declamation, and you shed so thick and painful a vapour behind you, as you proceed, that the reader, who follows you, is obliged often to stop and rub his eyes, and look about for a glimpse of light. And with what discovery is all this toil rewarded? He finds at last, that the purpose of all this rant and smoke was to teach him, that, in matters relating to the nature of God, he can have no information from his reason §, that it will here stand

† Page 199.

§ Page 23, or rather the whole chapter.

him in no kind of stead; that all propositions of this kind are, with respect to man's understanding, in themselves equally probable and true.

This I take to be your meaning, when conceived in plain language; and if I do mistake you, the blame, I think, is not wholly mine. If you are at all to be understood, you have delivered a doctrine which one would not have expected to hear from a professor of Protestantism, in a Protestant country, and in this age of light and enquiry: It is indeed calculated solely for the meridian of Rome; without it Popery cannot stand a single year; and if we admit it, we throw the gates of our Church wide open to receive Transubstantiation, and all the concomitant abominations of idolatrous worship.

In fact, reason was the first vehicle of information from God to men; it is as truly his gift, as any verbal or written revelation he ever afterwards vouchsafed to mankind. If he be a God of truth therefore, he cannot contradict himself, nor, by a subsequent discovery of his will, confound those truths which were received from him by a former communication. It may be true, and it certainly is true, "that reason cannot comprehend the infinite and incomprehensible nature of God:" But does it follow, that, because it cannot do all, it can do nothing? So far as it has clear, distinct, and
adequate

adequate conceptions, so far its decisions are infallible; and it makes no difference, whether its object be things earthly, or things heavenly; the nature of God, or the nature of man.

The certainty arises not from the nature of the object under contemplation, but from the clear perception it has of the agreement, or disagreement of its own ideas. Wherever it finds that, it finds certainty, ^{and} so far it may be safely trusted; nay, the man feels himself under a necessity of receiving or rejecting, whatever it thus legitimately decides, as assuredly true, or assuredly false. The Father and Giver of it, the gracious and wise God, has formed us intirely passive in the case; and truth, of whatsoever kind, clearly discerned, is the center, to which our assent is as forcibly impelled, as heavy matter towards the center of the earth.

Let us instance in a few propositions respecting the nature of God. First then, when reason has once attained the knowledge of this truth, that there is but one Supreme God, (in whatever way it gained this knowledge, whether by pursuing its own researches, or by Divine Revelation) it infallibly decides, and it cannot do otherwise, not even suspend its decision, that there are neither more, nor fewer, neither no God at all, nor yet three Supreme Gods. Secondly; When it has once discovered, in whatever way, that the Supreme God is infinitely

infinitely wise, just, and true, it determines absolutely, that whoever is not infinitely wise, just, and true, is not Supreme God. Thirdly; When it is once known, that the Supreme God is underived and self-existent, holding all his attributes by the necessity of his nature, and not at the pleasure of any other; reason concludes with intuitive certainty, that whoever is not underived and self-existent, whoever receives his attributes from, and holds them at the pleasure of another, is not Supreme God. Fourthly; When it is known, that the Supreme God "is without body, parts, or passions," it is at the same time known, and with as full evidence, that whoever is not "without body, parts, or passions," is not Supreme God.

If an Angel from heaven should teach the contrary of any of these conclusions, and though he should work innumerable miracles, yet reason would reject his evidence as of one deceived, or deceiving; because it would feel an irresistible conviction, that what he taught was false: And if you, Sir, have taught doctrines equally incredible, reason will rise up against you, and like neglected conscience, assert its own rights, and condemn you, however you may flatter yourself you had lulled it to sleep, or deposed it from its sovereignty.

Let us therefore examine your great proposition, which you pretend to deduce so confidently from
so

so many texts, " that Jesus Christ is with the Father, one God;" or, as you express yourself in other places, " that Jesus Christ is one with the Father, God;" or, " the Holy Ghost one with the Father and the Son, God *." With the first of these propositions you set out, and the second and the third you have adopted in various parts of your book. Now, Sir, if you are to be understood as speaking the common language of your country, you ought to mean, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are but different names of one and the same person, and consequently they must be one and the same God. This is the true, the only import of the English word *one*. If this were your meaning, you would be as arrant an Unitarian as the honest Apologist himself; with this difference however, that he, with the sacred penmen, preserves the distinction of persons, and you, with the Heretic Sabellius, take it away.

But, though you have chose to use the language of an Heretic, it appears from your whole book, that you mean no Heresy; and particularly from the vehement declamation with which you defend the established forms. I take it for granted therefore, that whatever induced you to depart from the language, your intention is to defend the doc-

* Page 209, and almost every page.

trine of the Athanasian Creed. By the words therefore of this Creed I must interpret yours, and suppose the burthen of all your arguments to be, that " the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God." The same Creed informs us farther, that " the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal," and that " each person is by himself God and Lord ;" that is, if I have any conception of the meaning of the terms, that the Father is Supreme God, the Son Supreme God, and the Holy Ghost Supreme God ; that there is a numerical and personal difference, and yet that they are all but one and the same Supreme God.

Now, Sir, human reason, the first source of knowledge planted by God in the mind of man, and which he could never afterwards contradict, informs me, that one Supreme God, and another Supreme God, and another Supreme God, are three Supreme Gods, and that three Supreme Gods cannot be one Supreme God ; and therefore that it cannot be true, that all three are Supreme Gods, and yet that there is but one Supreme God. And the misfortune is, that reason teaches me this so authoritatively, that I cannot but acquiesce in her information ; nay, that I feel in my own mind that she teaches me truly.

In

In such a dilemma, what solution shall I seek? You bid me renounce reason, and depend on revelation. But I know not what is revelation, otherwise than by the information of my reason; and she informs me that this proposition is false, by a much clearer evidence, than she affords me of the existence of any revelation whatever. Shall I therefore renounce the clearer, and be guided by the darker evidence? No; I will not do that; that would be to despise the most assured gift of God: I will not renounce my reason, but have consulted revelation; and, thank God, find no such proposition, expressed or implied, from the first to the last chapter of it.

The testimony of the Holy Ghost, in the inspired scriptures, is plain, positive, and uniform, that there is but *one living and true God*, and that the Father is he. This truth is repeatedly delivered in terms, that absolutely exclude the Son by name, first by St. John recording the words of Christ himself, *that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent* *; and again by St. Paul, *there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ* †. Again; our Saviour affirms of himself, *My Father is greater than I* ‡. *Of that day and that hour knoweth no*

* John xvii. 3.

† 1 Cor. viii. 6.

‡ John xiv. 28.

*man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father *. Then cometh the end when he shall have delivered up the kingdom (which he had received) to God, even the Father—for he (God) hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted that did put all things under him; and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him; that God may be all in all †.*

Does not the last quoted passage assert, that the Son received the kingdom from the Father, who is exclusively filed God; and that he must, at the consummation of all things, resign his powers to God, who gave them? Is it possible that the Son should receive the kingdom from himself, and resign it to himself? And, if he received it from another, and resigned it to another; is not that other, from whom he received it, and whose subject he is at last to become, his superior; as St. Paul asserts he was during his whole administration, when he observes *that he is excepted that did put all things under him?*

In conformity to this idea, of his owing the kingdom to the Father's appointment, our Savi-

* Mark xiii. 31.

† 1 Cor. xv. 24. &c.

our himself, in the most solemn act of sovereignty he shall ever exercise, the judgment of the last day, and the final sentence to be pronounced, acknowledges himself the dispenser of the Father's mercies. *Come*, says he to the righteous, *ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world* *. If the gracious design of giving everlasting life to good men originated equally from the whole Trinity, if our Saviour was equally the delegate of the whole, it is inconceivable that he should close his commission by requiring from them a recognition of the Father's goodness only. Where equal obligation is conferred, equal gratitude is due.

The texts just quoted, are indeed so positive in their testimony for the sole supremacy of the Father, that language affords not terms more decisive. In answer to these, what do you produce? You have ransacked the sacred pages almost from end to end; and yet you have not produced one text, or scrap of a text, which affirms that the Father is not the one true God; that the Son is the one true God; that he was any thing, which the Father did not make him, or possessed any powers which the Father did not give him. All that you have done is by way of interpretation and

* Mat. xxv. 34.

inference, and how lame you are in these will appear by and by.

That God promised to bring about a particular event, and that that event was finally accomplished by the Son, is no proof of the Son's supreme and independent Divinity. It proves indeed, and this is all it can prove, that the Son was the Father's instrument, who accomplished the event by his mediation.

That Jesus Christ worked miracles, raised the dead, forgave sins, shall judge the world, and give everlasting life, if he possessed these powers in his own proper and underived right, might seem to be something to your purpose. But is it not astonishing, that, when you read such declarations as these, you should pay no attention to those draw-backs, with which they are qualified, and rendered utterly inadequate to your conclusion? Such as, *My Father is greater than I* *; *the Son can do nothing of himself* †; *the Father hath committed all judgment to the Son*; *hath given to the Son to have life in himself*; *I can of my own self do nothing*; *the works which the Father hath given me to finish* ‡, *I can do nothing of myself, but as the Father hath*

* John xiv. 28. † John v. 19. ‡ Ibidem 22, 26, 30, 36.
taught

*taught me, I speak these things *; the Father which sent me, gave me commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak †; as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do ‡; it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell §; God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him ||.*

Now, if the Father was greater than the Son; if the Son could do nothing of himself; if he held the judgment by the Father's commission, and life as the Father's gift; if the Father appointed the works he was to finish, and taught and commanded him what he should speak, and what he should do; if the fullness that was in him, depended on the Father's pleasure, and he was not qualified for his high office, without an immeasurable portion of the Holy Spirit; what is the fair inference from all this; Not surely, that he was the Supreme God, of whom not one of these, or similar propositions, would be true; but that he was the Father's messenger and minister; that, whatever mighty works distinguished his ministration, they were all the effects of the Father's power acting in him, and by him: Or, if you please, that he was *sanctified and sent by the Father.*

* John viii. 28. † John xii. 49. ‡ John xiv. 31.

§ Col. i. 19.

|| John iii. 34.

Again;

Again; The magnificent titles with which he is invested, the high honours ordained for him in heaven and in earth, shall be allowed to prove, that he is a most stupendously glorious Being; *that the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand* *; but we must stop short of absolute Godhead, when we read such passages as the following. *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father* †.

In God, the supreme and self-existent God, we know from revelation as well as reason, that there is *no variableness, neither shadow of turning* ‡. It is impossible therefore, that the supreme, self-existent God should either be abased (as St. Paul, in the preceding verses, informs us Jesus Christ was) or exalted. And what is the more remarkable, he assumed not this super-eminent degree of exaltation to himself, but God exalted him, in reward of his personal merits, under the restriction, *that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*.

* John iii. 35.

† Phil. ii. 9, 11.

‡ James i. 17.

Is not one of these glorious Beings manifestly inferior to the other? Can it be God, who gave, or Christ, who received; the Son who is appointed to so high honours; or the Father, who in the formal act of investiture, has made a reserve of his own pre-eminence, and conditioned that these honours shall ultimately be referred to his own glory?

These few plain texts, and plain remarks, I am persuaded, are sufficient to give a compleat defeat to that host of shreds and patches which you have arrayed, with so formidable an appearance, under your banners; and if the matter were to be decided by plain common sense, I should think it unnecessary to give you further trouble. But a staunch Athanasian is not so easily to be conquered; he has as many shifts as a weather-beaten fox; he varies shapes with the dexterity of a Proteus; and, though he has the words Heresy and Heretics perpetually in his mouth, there is not an Heretic of them all, of ever so odious name, or odious tenets, whose semblance he deigns not to assume, when he is pinched by a capable adversary, or the interest of the cause requires it. When the first is no longer for his purpose, he slips into a second, or a third; and when stripped of that, resumes his original shape, and boldly claims the ground from which he had been fairly driven.

To

To justify this representation, I need but appeal to your own conduct. At your setting out, your language and your features were downright Sabellian, and some attention was necessary to see through the disguise. At page 201, you figure in the garb and ensigns of a Tritheist, or maintainer of three equal Gods. For there we read this very extraordinary remark; ‘ as to this assertion,’ “ that we who join in the four invocations, “ at the beginning of the Litany, can be ill defended against the charge of holding four Gods, “ to wit, the Father, the Son, and the Holy “ Ghost, and the Trinity;” ‘ it is about as wisely put, as if we should say, that the government at ‘ Rome was administered not by three, but by four ‘ men, to wit, Octavius, Lepidus, Anthony and the ‘ Triumvirate.’ Now, either there is some analogy between the terms Triumvirate and Trinity, or there is not. If not, you have mocked your readers with mere idle sounds. This surely you could not mean to do. There must therefore be some analogy; and that analogy can lie in nothing but this, that as the term Triumvirate stands for the idea of three men, numerically and substantially distinct, exercising a joint and equal authority; so the term Trinity conveys the idea of three Gods, numerically and substantially distinct, in the exercise of equal powers and dominion. And if the Father be God, numerically and substan-

substantially distinct from the Son, the Son from the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost from both; there will then be three equal Gods, as certainly as Octavius, Anthony, and Lepidus were three men: And if this is not; what is Tritheism? But this illustration is most unfortunate in another respect; it bears not the smallest resemblance to the point you would illustrate: To make it pertinent, it ought to have been said, that Octavius was a man, Lepidus a man, Anthony a man, and yet all three conjoined—a man; and if you had put it thus, you would have left Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Clarke in full possession of their consequence: For he who can count to four, would find the Triumvirate to have been a fourth man.

Thus you are by turns a Sabellian; and a Tritheist; sometimes a strict Unitarian, and sometimes declaiming loudly for the doctrine of three equal Gods. But at the present pinch Sabellianism and Tritheism will do nothing for you: They afford no answer to so many plain texts of Scripture, that so positively assert the Father's superiority, and the inferiority of the Son. What therefore is to be done? Why, there is another class of Heretics, whose peculiar error it is to divide Christ; to consider him not as one individual person, but as two. According to these, there was a

D

Christ,

Christ, who came down from heaven, and was God; and a Christ, who was born of the Virgin, and was man.

Now, here is the very thing you want; "The Man Christ Jesus, you say *, was inferior to God; that is having two natures, one was greater, and consequently one less than the other." When therefore the Scriptures speak of his inferiority to the Father, we must understand them as speaking of his "less nature," that is as of mere man. But the question is not whether he had two natures, but whether he had two persons. If he had two persons, (which you must mean, if you mean to help yourself out of the difficulty) then you are no longer an Athanasian, or Sabellian, but a Cerinthian: If he had but one person, then whatever is said of Christ, must be understood of but one person, and that one person must be inferior to the Father, except one and the same person could be inferior, and not inferior to one and the same Father.

Your two natures therefore are, in your apprehension, two persons; and this is all the answer you vouchsafe to give to all that weight of evidence, by which his absolute inferiority may seem

* Layman, page 17.

to be proved. This is not only all you do say, but all you can say; and a wretched all it is. For, even granting that you have some fetch in your own mind, by which you persuade yourself, that, when you speak of the two natures of Christ, you mean not two persons; yet you must mean at least, that the personal pronouns, I, Thou, He, are frequently spoken not of whole Christ, but of a very inconsiderable part of him. This is a conceit which absolutely destroys all certainty in language; and what is worse, it is a mere gratis dictum, a direct begging of the question. For you have not produced, you cannot produce one word of Scripture, not the most distant innuendo, that the person of Christ is not one undivided, and indivisible person; that whatever is affirmed of him, is not affirmed of whole Christ, of that Son of God who came down from heaven, was made flesh, died and rose again, and was by the Father, made *both Lord and Christ*.

The Scriptures will not help you out, but you will help yourself. The interests of the cause were all at stake: For without this shift, Athanasianism is gone for ever. It is but boldly affirming, and the necessity must justify the venture. Such are the miserable consequences, when human authority invades God's province, and erects a tribunal to controul the wisdom of the Holy Spirit.

Error is established, and perhaps in no long time detected: It is not however renounced; that would disgrace the authority that set it up. The same authority goes to work again therefore, and hopes to salve the former error by a second decision; it decides erroneously a second time, and thus error was propagated upon error in the Christian world to so enormous a degree, that, for several successive ages, Paganism itself wore as fair a face as Christianity.

Seeing therefore you can produce no Scripture to prove, that Christ is ever spoken of as two persons, or that his whole person is not meant in every passage, where he is named; I will produce two texts, which, in my opinion, demonstrably prove his inferiority to the Father, even in his greater nature, as you choose to speak, or as he is God.

The first is John v. 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do.* Not to mention the absurdity of the supposition, that Christ came down from heaven to teach men so well known a truth, as that mere man cannot work miracles, Son and Father here must be reciprocal terms; and therefore Son cannot mean Son of man, or man, but the Son of God, or Christ in his greater nature; or as the Pseudo-Athanasius expresses

presses it, " God of the substance of the Father, " begotten before the worlds; not man of the substance of his mother born in the world." If therefore Christ in his greater nature, or in the language of you and Athanasius, as he was God, could do nothing of himself, but as he was enabled by the Father, Christ in his greater nature was inferior to the Father.

The other text is, Mark xiii. 32. *Of that day, and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Surely a divine revelation was not necessary to prove, that mere man did not know the day of judgment. This was as certainly known before, as it could be since our Saviour's appearance. Father and Son therefore must again be reciprocal terms, and the same conclusion follows. If you say, after all, that possibly Son may mean Son of man, or Jesus Christ in his " less nature;" I insist that it is a doctrine of Athanasianism, that he was the Son of the Father before he was born into the world, and that, if he had never been born, he would notwithstanding have been a Son: Else what will become of the eternal generation?

Consider the fact therefore in this light, could he, in his " greater" nature, of himself perform miraculous works; or did he know that day and hour?

hour? If he could do the one, and knew the other; he could do the one, and knew the other only as a Son; for he was always a Son. Could he therefore truly say, in the former case, that the *Son* could do nothing; and in the latter, that the *Son* knew not the day and hour, but the *Father* only; when at the same time, it might with the utmost certainty have been affirmed, that the *Son* could do every thing, and knew every thing as well as the Father himself? Such equivocation could come with little propriety from the mouth of the Son of God, and it is with as little decency forced upon him by the whole tribe of Athanasians. This indeed is most inconsistent with their own principles, but consistency and orthodoxy are not always at accord.

You have had an uneasy time, I know well enough, among your Cerinthian allies; but you dare not leave them yet: If you have any hope, it depends entirely on them. I shall find you by and by at your proper post, and, when it is your cue, maintaining the Unity of Christ's person, as firmly as the Unity of his Godhead with the Father. In the mean time you must allow me to keep possession of your own camp, and turn its deserted artillery upon you.

Neque

*Neque Lex est justior ulla,
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua.*

Take your Common Prayer-book therefore, and behold what the counterfeit Athanasius teaches to all his disciples: " Though he (Christ) be God " and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ: One " altogether," that is, in the strictest sense of unity. Again; " as the reasonable soul and flesh is one " man, so God and man is one Christ;" that is, as really one person, as the reasonable soul and flesh is one person. I ask therefore, could one and the same person both know and not know the same thing at the same time? Did our Saviour really know the day and hour in his " greater" nature, which now united to his " less" made together with it one person, as truly as the united body and soul of man are one person, when he so solemnly assures his disciples he knew it not? A witness in a court of justice delivering such an evidence would be indicted of perjury, and an honest jury would convict him, notwithstanding the miserable quibble, if he should dare to alledge it, that his flesh was really ignorant, though his reasonable soul knew well enough.

Shall we not shudder to put a sort of language in the mouth of the messenger of the God of truth, nay, as you call him, the God of truth himself, which would bring a frail mortal to condign punishment?

nishment? This single consideration is wont to affect me so forcibly, that I can hardly forbear to weep, when I hear serious and well-disposed Christians talk of their holy Redeemer, of the blessed Son of him *who hateth a lie*, in a strain so exceedingly gross and blasphemous. Pardon the severity of the expression: the vast importance of the subject extorted it from me; and I cannot retract it, while I am convinced that the preaching of Christianity must for ever be ineffectual for the general conversion of mankind, so long as it is exhibited in a form so revolting to common sense; and its powers enfeebled, or rather smothered and extinguished, beneath a mass of human inventions, defended by palpable contradictions and absurdity. Not one Jew, not one Mahometan, in such circumstances, can become a Christian; hardly a Pagan will exchange idolatry for a system, that looks at him with so distorted and deformed a visage.

On such pitiful sophistry the whole of your system is founded; on a kind of sophistry, that admits of so easy, so full, and, if I may be allowed to say it, in my judgment, so unanswerable a confutation. For if there is no authority of Scripture for dividing the person of Christ; if there is but a single text, that exhibits him, in his "greater nature," as you affect to speak, as inferior to the Father, your whole reasoning is overthrown, and
must

must pass away like the baseless fabric of a vision. Such texts, I think, I have produced, plain, positive, and incapable of other interpretation. If there are others therefore, that at first sight seem to look a different way, Scripture cannot contradict itself, and the less clear must give way to the more clear: In fact, there is not one text, in which Jesus Christ is mentioned, even in his highest state of glory, but is capable of an easy reconciliation with this his own positive assertion, *My Father is greater than I*; while itself is utterly irreconcilable with the idea of his equality or sameness with God the Father.

You must be sensible, one would suppose, that at least you have been playing on the brink of an absurdity; that if your system is true, it is the most astonishing, nay, in itself, the most incredible, that ever was presented to the human mind. This might have taught you some modesty and diffidence; but assured of your own abilities, and swollen with imaginary infallibility, you have exhibited a specimen of hardness, (I mean to speak charitably when I call it hardness) such as perhaps was never before equalled. Here are your words.

“ Either Jesus Christ is one with the Father,
 “ God, or he is not; either the Holy Ghost is one
 “ with the Father and the Son, God, or he is not.
 E . On

“ On supposing that the negative side of this di-
 “ lemma can be assumed, (and for argument's sake
 “ it must be supposed, however irksome) a conse-
 “ quence ensues, horrible to thought. The God
 “ of peace becomes a firebrand of contention, ten-
 “ fold confusion proceeds from God, *who is not*
 “ *the author of confusion ; the spirit of truth is a liar ;*
 “ the simple and guileless zeal of the Apostles, is
 “ crafty and designing duplicity ; the wisdom of
 “ God, folly, beneath the foolishness of men ; and
 “ the revelation of the God of truth, from end to
 “ end, scarce the word of designing fallhood, it
 “ must have proceeded from a dupe to his own
 “ artifices *.”

Pray, good Sir, moderate your wrath, and
 hear a word for the defendants. Either it was the
 will of God, that all honest, and serious, and ca-
 pable enquirers should find these propositions indis-
 putably revealed, or it was not. If such were his
 will, all such enquirers would certainly find them :
 but all honest, and serious, and capable enquirers
 have not found these propositions indisputably re-
 vealed ; and therefore the other side of the dilemma
 is certainly true, and it was not his will that all
 such enquirers should so find them. But what
 then ? God has given such a revelation as he knew

* Layman, page 229.

would

would best answer his gracious purpose of bringing good men to everlasting life, and no particular harm has been done to you. If you like not revelation as it is, you are not obliged to receive it; why therefore should you so outrageously

“ Cry havoc, and let loose the dogs of war ? ”

Why should you pour out a torrent of foul language against the venerable Apostles, for recording faithfully the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, and against the Holy Spirit, and against God, for doing what was properest, and wisest, and best ?

But you proceed, “ I shudder as I write ; ” and well you may.—But I have done with remarks, except that such hot, burning zeal is no proper disposition of mind for studying the religion of the meek and humble Jesus, nor indeed for the discovery of truth in general, which requires a steady, peaceable, and calm attention. I will add, that perhaps a cautious man would not think more favourably of a doctrine, that was not found by Newton, Locke, Clarke, and a long list besides of the ablest enquirers ; men, to whom Christianity owes the most essential services, who were burning and shining lights, and with respect to whom the Layman stands at an immense distance.

Before I proceed to consider your texts, I must be allowed to quote another passage, which, though

in a different way, is full as extraordinary as the preceding; and at the same time I shall take the liberty to contrast with it a few verses of Holy Scripture.

Thus speaks Paganism and Popery by the pen of the Layman, page 150.

“ The goodness of
 “ God, and that gra-
 “ cious indulgence with
 “ which he has consulted
 “ the infirmities of our
 “ state, is in this respect
 “ also very strongly dif-
 “ played, that he took
 “ manhood on him, in
 “ order to give a *sensible*
 “ *object of worship* to man-
 “ kind, incapable of
 “ forming any adequate
 “ idea of the abstract
 “ God, whose qualities
 “ are of a nature incom-
 “ prehensible by our
 “ minds. The world
 “ merged in Idolatry at
 “ the time of his incar-
 “ nation,

Thus speaks true religion by the mouth of Moses, the Prophet of God. Deut. chap. 4.

The Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. Verse 12.

Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you, in Horeb, out of the midst of the fire) lest you corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likenesses of male or female, the likeness of any beast that is on the earth, the likeness of any winged fowl that flieth in

" nation, was mercifully *in the air, the likeness of*
 " indulged with an ob- *any thing that creepeth on*
 " ject of sense—to whom *the ground, the likeness of*
 " even by the exertion *any thing that is in the wa-*
 " of the same faculties by *ters under the earth. Verses*
 " which they had adopt- 16, 17, 18.
 " ed and adored Idols,
 " they could prefer wor-
 " ship, without the im-
 " putation of Idolatry."

Now, Sir, I begin with your texts; but shall examine comparatively very few; both because it would be endless to trace you through all your windings, through all your wrestings and torturings of Scripture, and because, what I have before advanced, contains, in my judgment, a full and satisfactory answer to all you have alledged. Such therefore only I shall attend to, as either look with some face of importance on your side, or are distinguished by your very extraordinary application.

Page 54. " Thy kingdom come," Matth. vi. 10.
 " Thine is the kingdom, and the power and the
 " glory, for ever and ever. Amen." Matth. vi. 13.

These words are part of the Lord's prayer, of that prayer, which our Saviour taught his Disciples on a very particular occasion, when they in-
 treated

treated his information, how they ought to pray; and you move heaven and earth to prove this prayer to be addressed to the Son. The first words of it are these, *Our Father which art in heaven*. The person therefore, to whom it is addressed, was then in heaven. But are you sure the Disciples knew the Son to be in heaven at the time, or that he really was in heaven? He took much pains to teach them the contrary. He told them, *that he came down from heaven**; *that he was come from God†*; *that he came forth from the Father, and came into the world‡*; that as he came from God, *he was to go to God§*; *that he was to go to the Father||*; that he was to leave the world, and go to the Father**; *to ascend to his Father, and their Father, to his God, and their God††*; that he was to ascend up where he was before‡‡. Did he ever tell them that, notwithstanding all this, he was still in heaven? Or if he was all this time still in heaven, what occasion could he have to ascend up where he was before, that is, to return to the very place which he had never left? You will not say, that his human nature had ever been in heaven, or that it could return where it had never been. If therefore the Son was not at this time in heaven, the Son could not be the person to whom this prayer is addressed.

* John vi. 38.

† John xiii. 3.

‡ John xvi. 28.

§ John xiii. 3.

|| John xiv. 28.

** John xvi. 28.

†† John xx. 17.

‡‡ John vi. 62.

It is impossible to say, what a disputant of your peculiar cast may choose to reply at such a pinch. One may conjecture however, that you would quote John iii. 13. *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven.* If you should, I would restore consistency to the text, by rectifying the translation, and reading, *The Son of man who was in heaven.* The Greek is *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ ἔρηνῳ*, and it is reasonable surely to give it that meaning, which alone can make sense of the passage, and set Scripture at accord with Scripture. For the participle *ὢν* is in different to the past and present time. That the participle is capable of this rendering, you may have demonstration by John ix. 25, *He answered and said, whether he be a sinner or no, I cannot tell. One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see, ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω.* The same participle *ὢν* is rendered, in the two different texts, by the two different English words *is* and *was*; for what reason the translators knew best: For in both, the verb *was* is equally necessary to the sense; and it is equally impossible that a person should at the same time be in the place from which he had descended, and that he who sees should be blind*.

For this meaning of the participle *ὢν*, see John i. 18.—
xix; 38. 2 Cor. viii. 9.

But

But at all events, this prayer must be addressed to the Son. Now, Sir, we will examine your reasons. They must have extraordinary weight, if they support so extraordinary a conclusion. Why, at the end of it you read the word kingdom, and the word glory; and you likewise read in the Holy Scriptures of the kingdom and glory of the Son. But did you never read of the kingdom and glory of the Father; of a kingdom and glory given by the Father to the Son; of *the Father who loved the Son, and gave all things into his hand*? Do you not even quote a Scripture, that mentions the kingdom of Christ and of God? If therefore the Father had a kingdom and glory of his own, and the Son had neither, but as he received them from the Father; how will it follow, that the kingdom and glory, at the conclusion of the prayer, means the subordinate and commissary kingdom of the Son, and not the original, undelegated, underived supremacy of the Father? Is the Son once mentioned in the whole? No; but Son and Father in your Divinity are synonymous terms. Away with such illusion! When God Almighty condescended to reveal his will to mankind, he certainly applied the terms of human language in the very sense that gave them currency among men: Otherwise he could not have made himself at all understood, without another revelation to explain his terms; he would have talked a jargon, that

that would have conveyed no more meaning than the language of Otaheite to an European. Father therefore in his language cannot mean Son, nor Son Father: Ex uno disce omnes.

Page 58. "Who can forgive sins, but God alone?" None, by a primary right; but the Son of man also received power from God to forgive them.

Page 66. "Jesus said unto them before Abraham was, I am." John viii. 58.

It is not easy to find out what you mean to make of this expression, *I am*; whether you have determined to consider it as an ordinary verb, or the proper name of God. If you take it for a proper name, you represent our Saviour as giving just as intelligible an answer to the question, whether he had seen Abraham, as if he had said, John, or Thomas. If you allow it to be a verb, I allow it to be of the present tense; but the context requires, that it here have a past signification; and then all will be rational and intelligible, literally thus, I was, before Abraham was born, *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι*. And there is no mystery in this. It is a well-known maxim in grammar, that the *present* tense is a tense of all times; and any little boy will inform you, that he cannot proceed

F through

through many pages together of a Classic author, without finding the necessity of applying it. Accept of a few instances in either language.

“ Cratera antiquum, quem *dat* Sidonia Dido.”
An ancient goblet, which Queen Dido *gives*—
Though Dido was dead and reduced to ashes long before this time *.

Ποτὲρα δ' ἐν οἰκοῖς, ἢ ἔν' ἀγροῖς ὁ Λαῖος,
ἢ γὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλης τῷδε συμπίπτει φόνῳ †.

The Greek verb συμπίπτει is of the present tense, and yet expresses a fatal accident, that had happened to Laius so long before, that his widow had married, and had had several children by her second husband, before the time of speaking this.

Ὡ μὴ ᾽στί δρῶντι τάρβος, ὅδ' ἔπος φοβέει ‡. Him, who *was* not afraid to commit the fact, words *will* not terrify.

Ὅ γάρ ἐστι χεῖριστον αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶ παρεληλυθότος χρόνου, τὸ τοῦ πρὸς τα μελλόντα βελτιστον ὑπάρχει §.
What *was* the worst circumstance in our affairs in

* Virg. Æn. 9. 266.

† Soph. Ædi. Ty. 112.

‡ Soph. ibidem 304.

§ Philip. prima Mounteney's edition.

time

time past, bears the most hopeful aspect with regard to futurity. It was thus understood by the Scholiast; ὁ ὕμας ἐκ τῆ παρεληλυθότος ἐβλάψε χρόνον, that which prejudiced your affairs in time past: And thus also Demosthenes explains himself, το χεριστον ἐν τοις παρεληλυθοσι, τωτο πρὸς τα μελλοντα βελτιστον ὑπαρχει *

In the following quotation from the same Orator, the present must be put for the future tense; because he is speaking of the consequences of a regulation he had just proposed. Ἐξεστίν ἀγειν ἡσυχίαν; ἄνθρωποι μετῶν εἰ βελτιῶν, τῷ δὲ ἐνδεῖαν ἀνάγκη τι ποιεῖν ἀσχρόν ἀπὸ πηλλαγμένος. Συμβαίνει τι τοιοῦτον οἶον καὶ τανῦν †; *Shall* there be no occasion to take the field? While you continue at home, you *will* be a more respectable person, being freed from the temptation of poverty to commit a base action. *Shall* any conjuncture like the present fall out? &c.

It is exceeding common with the Comic writers to put the present tense to express both past and future time; and therefore it may be presumed that such a practice was not unusual in familiar conversation. Thus Terence † Cum inde abeo,

* Vide notas in Philip. primam page 215. † Page 107.
of the same edition. ‡ Eunus, Act 4th. Scene 4th.

jam tum inceperat turba inter eos. When I *came* away, a quarrel was begun between them. And again*; Thra. Quid *agimus*? Gna. Quin redeamus. What *shall* we do? Let us even march back.

Page 67. "I and my Father are one." John x. 30.

In the original it is *iv*, not *es*, one thing, not one God. And our Saviour explains his own meaning very fully, where he makes this prayer, *Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are; that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may know that thou hast sent me;—that they may be one, even as we are one;—that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me†.* Do you not know that this very answer has been given a thousand times; that it has never been refuted; that, if it be capable of refutation, you ought to have done your cause that service, before you had alledged this text, which our Saviour himself so strongly intimates to be impertinent?

* Act 4th. Scene 7th.

† John xvii. 11. 22. 24.

Page 89. "The grace of God, who hath to
 " the Gentiles also granted repentance unto life.
 " Acts xi. 14, &c. But we believe, that through
 " the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be
 " saved. Acts xv. 11. Here the grace of the
 " Lord Jesus, and of God, are one and the same."

No wonder: For the Lord Jesus is the minister
 and dispenser of the grace of God; and he would
 not dispense faithfully, if he dispensed any other
 grace, which he had not received.

Page 94. "In the Acts, St. Luke says, that be-
 " cause Paul preached Jesus to the Athenians, they
 " said he seemed to be a setter-forth of *strange*
 " *Gods*. Acts xvii. 18.—Here, upon a call to ex-
 " plain himself, and answer the charge of setting
 " forth *strange Gods*, in having preached Jesus, he
 " avows, that he whom he had preached was that
 " God whom they knew not, (the unknown
 " God) but worshipped ignorantly: but he had
 " preached Jesus; therefore Jesus Christ was that
 " God hitherto unknown to them, and one with
 " the Father."

Really, Sir, this is a most ingenious argument,
 and wants nothing but truth in the premises to
 support the conclusion. The whole of it, such as
 it is, depends on a supposition, that the terms
strange

strange Gods and *unknown God*, relate to the same person; (and what will not a bigotted Athanasian suppose, when he hopes to serve his hypothesis?) but this supposition will be found totally void of foundation. The original words for *strange Gods* are *Ξένων δαιμονίων*; *Ξένων* means foreign, of another country, and *δαιμονίων*, to the best of my present recollection, is, in every other passage of Scripture, translated *devils*. If it had been so translated here, then we should have read, that Paul was a setter-forth of foreign *devils*: But you could have made nothing at all of this; it would have founded a note quite in discord with your tune. The word, however, in the system of Pagan theology, means Deities of an inferior and ministerial cast; sometimes the spirits of dead men deified; sometimes even more imaginary beings, who had never had any real existence *. Of the one sort, or the other of these, they had a surprising multiplicity, for almost all the occasions and incidents of life; and whom they worshipped, as the Papists at this day their tutelary Saints, with excessive superstition. This is what St. Paul reproves in them afterwards, when he tells them, that they were in all things *ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρες*, too much addicted to—What? not surely the worship of the one

* See Joseph Mede's Treatise on the Apostasy of the latter times, chap. iv. page 629. edit. 3.

true God, but to that of imaginary inferior Divinities. This meaning of the word, therefore, may afford some probability that St. Paul had preached Jesus Christ as the mediator, as the Father's minister, or messenger; but if he meant to exhibit him as the one true and supreme God, he had acquitted himself very ill, and speaking too by inspiration, if he raised the conceptions of his audience no higher than to their own petty and menial Divinities.

But farther; The sacred Historian, giving the reason why St. Paul was questioned as a setter-forth of foreign (Gods) Dæmons, says, *because he preached τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν Ἀνάστασιν, Jesus and the Resurrection.* The latter you have had the address to keep out of your reader's view; though, the expression *foreign Dæmons* being plural, a doubt may arise, whether it be not meant of both. It is possible that the Athenians, habituated to dæmonize almost every idea of the human mind, might mistake the latter word, as they certainly did the former, for the name of a Dæmon; and in that case Paul was questioned, as the great and wise Socrates had before been put to death, as a setter-forth of strange, or foreign Dæmons, Dæmons really plural, namely Jesus and Ἀνάστασις, the Resurrection. I will not insist, that this is certainly St. Luke's meaning; but his words being fairly

capable

capable of this interpretation, you ought to have proved, that it certainly was not, before you had argued so peremptorily from one half of the reason recorded, to the utter exclusion of the other. Otherwise a sturdy disputant, disposed to defend every inch of ground, might fight you with your own weapons, and making a proper use of what you have been pleased to leave of the text, arrive, by the very same steps, at a very different conclusion. Thus; “because Paul preached *Ἀνάστασις*, “to the Athenians, they said he seemed to be a “setter-forth of strange Gods. Here, upon a call “to explain himself, and answer the charge of “setting-forth strange Gods, in having preached “*Ἀνάστασις*, he avows, that the Divinity, whom “he had preached, was that God, whom they knew “not (the unknown God) but worshipped ignorantly: but he had preached *Ἀνάστασις*, therefore *Ἀνάστασις*, *i. e.* the Resurrection, was that “God hitherto unknown to them, and one with “the Father.”.

Such an adversary might have quoted great authorities both ancient and modern for this interpretation of *Ἀνάστασις**; and to say the truth, it seems to be a very dubious point, whether St.

* Conjectures on the New Testament, printed for W. Bowyer and J. Nichols. Page 163.

Luke did not really mean so. Certainly to mangle Scripture at this strange rate is not fair treatment of your readers, of whom perhaps not one in forty would consult his Bible.

But to proceed; When Paul afterwards, standing in the midst of Mars' Hill explains his own doctrine, and mentions his accidental discovery of an Altar inscribed *to the unknown God*, does he tell his audience, does he give them the smallest intimation, that Jesus was that *unknown God*, whom they ignorantly worshipped? Quite the contrary. After a spirited and sublime description of several of his attributes and actions, he comes at length to inform them, that, though *he had winked at their former ignorance*; yet *he now commandeth all men every where to repent*; because *he (the unknown God) hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness*, by *that Man (Jesus Christ) whom he (the unknown God) hath ordained*; whereof *he hath given assurance unto all men*; in that *he (the unknown God) hath raised him (Jesus Christ) from the dead*. Is it possible to mark their different attributes and characters more strongly?

Surely (I had like to have said such shameless sophistry) such a mortifying proof of the power of bigotry and prejudice never before fell from the pen of man. Such alacrity in the cause certainly

entitles you to some mark of pre-eminence. Another genius, famous in his way, hath pre-engaged the motto of *Sum Solus*; yet *sume decus meritis quasitum*, and let yours be *quando invenies parem*.

But you go on to prove that the God whom Paul preached at Athens, and Jesus Christ have the same attributes.

" Of God whom he	" Of Jesus Christ, ex-
" preached at Athens,	" pressly so named, he
" even Jesus, he says.	" says.

" God that made the	" By him were all
" world, and all things	" things created, that
" therein, seeing he is	" are in heaven, and
" the Lord of heaven	" that are in earth, vi-
" and earth, ver. 24.	" sible and invisible,
" for in him we live,	" whether they be
" and move, and have	" thrones, or dominions,
" our being, ver. 28."	" or principalities, or
	" powers; all things
	" were created by him,
	" and for him. And he is
	" before all things, and
	" by him all things con-
	" sist. Col. i. 16, 17."

That

That Jesus was not the *unknown God*, whom Paul preached at Athens, has been just demonstrated. That he is not the Supreme God, your readers would have known by intuition, if you had been pleased to close the magnificent amplification, in which St. Paul has here displayed his wonderful dignity, with the Apostle's own words. *For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.* All this fullness therefore, all these powers, and attributes depended on the Father's pleasure; but the fullness, powers, and attributes of the Supreme God are necessarily in him, and can depend on nothing. Jesus therefore, whose fullness, powers, and attributes are dependent, is not the Supreme God.

You may reply that the words, *The Father*, are not in the original, but have been inserted by the translators. This is very true, but will not help you out. The original words are, *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδαιμονία πάντοτε πληροῦμα κατοικῆσαι*; literally, *It was the good pleasure of — that in him should all fullness dwell.* The good pleasure of whom? either of the Son, whose attributes are here enumerated; or of the Father, with the mention of whom the amplification was introduced. Suppose, therefore, of the Son; then his powers and attributes depended on his own pleasure, and he could assume, or lay them down at his own option. Then he could not be

the necessarily and self-existent God; for his attributes and perfections are as necessary, as his existence; not to mention that it is not over good sense to say, that any person's fullness, or perfection, depends on his own will. Go back again therefore to the introductory word, Father, and the former consequence will return, that Jesus is not Supreme God; because his fullness is dependent on the Father's pleasure. Upon the whole, our translators have judiciously inserted the word *Father*; and, I believe, you will have no objection, when you see, that the change of it into *Son* will avail you nothing.

Page 102. "Whose are the Father's, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Romans ix. 5."

It is not denied, that Jesus Christ is sometimes styled God in the Holy Scriptures, in a secondary, or subordinate sense; and not Jesus Christ only, but the Angel who spake to Moses in the bush*; and Moses himself was instead of a God to his brother Aaron†, and was made a God to Pharaoh‡; Princes are called Gods: *And he*

* Exod. iii. 3, 4. Acts vii. 30.

† Exod. vii. 1.

‡ Exod. vi. 16.

called

called them Gods to whom the word of God came *. It will not therefore follow, that by God, in this passage, must be understood, the one true and self-existent God; especially as the very same Apostle has assured us, in words the most express and definite that language can supply, that though *there be Gods many, and Lords many, yet to us there is but one God*, one true and self-existent God, *the Father*; and that in opposition to Jesus Christ, who is the *one Lord*.

This I say on the supposition that the word *Θεός*, God, is spoken of the person of Christ. But you, Sir, who undertake to be an expounder of God's word, ought to have known, that expositors of great name, and among the rest Mr. Locke, have proceeded on the contrary supposition. They knew this was the single text, that, at first view, seemed to ascribe Supreme Godhead to the Son, and they saw the necessity of interpreting in such a sense as might not run counter to the whole currency of Scripture.

In this they acted like wise and cautious men, with becoming reverence towards the word of truth, which must always speak the same thing. But you, Sir, had none of their scruples; the

* John x. 35.

sound of the words was on your side, and the majority of your readers would be determined by sound alone, and had never heard of Mr. Locke or his exposition. It would have been but fair, however, to have informed them that he interpreted the passage thus; *Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, viz. by the Father's appointment, God be blessed for ever. Amen.* If this translation can be justified, it brings destruction on your inference; and you ought to have given your reasons why it could not, and not to have quoted the common translation, as conveying the indisputable meaning of the text.

Though I differ from so great and good a man with infinite diffidence, I own I am not satisfied with this interpretation; and my reason is, because I think the Greek word *εὐλογητος* signifies not (benedictus) blessed, but (benedicendus) worthy to be blessed, and that, *God be worthy to be blessed*, is not either good sense, or good English. I am not, however, peremptory in this, and may be mistaken. In another opinion, I think, I am not mistaken, that a plain, rational, and Unitarian sense may be put upon the passage, without supplying one word, or altering the common pointing.

The original words are these, *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητός εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα.* Let us take St.
Paul

Paul therefore for his own interpreter. In the xvth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians, quoted before on another occasion, we read these words; Then cometh the end, the *συντελεια τῷ αἰῶνος*, as St. Matthew calls it *, *when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and authority and power: For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him; that God may be all in all.* This delegated kingdom therefore was to last till the *συντελεια τῷ αἰῶνος*, and agreeably hereto it is said, that *God appointed him heir of all things, and by him ἐποίησε τῶν αἰώνων*, (made) *disposed the ages* †, the different periods of the world, with respect to God's moral government, of which the Christian is to be the last.

Here we have Jesus Christ exhibited as holding the kingdom in quality of the Father's Vicegerent; and this Vicegerency is to continue till the *end*, the consummation of the *age*, the last or Christian period, and consequently of all the periods, all *which* he ordered or disposed, when it is to be resigned to God who gave it. We know likewise from a variety of passages in the Sacred Writings, that he

† Mat. xxiv. 3.

† Heb. i. 2.

who

who acted or spoke in the name, and with the authority of God, is stiled God in an inferior and qualified sense; much more, therefore, may Jesus Christ, who is transcendently the greatest of God's ministers. It may therefore be true of Jesus Christ, *that he is over all God to be blessed ἐν τοῖς αἰῶνας, so long as the ages shall continue*, and yet that he is not the one true and self-existent God.

Whether this interpretation, or Mr. Locke's, give the truer meaning of the original, is not of much importance in the question. If either of them, or any other that ascribes not supreme Godhead to the Son, result grammatically from the words, and exhibit a sense consistent with the whole strain of Scripture, they all equally destroy your argument, which depends on the supposed certainty, that the words are incapable of being otherwise understood.

Thus far I have supposed the present to be the true reading of the text, but you must now be told that a suspicion has arisen, that a small transposition has happened, that gives it a very different complexion from that which it originally bore. This suspicion too is not taken up merely to solve a difficulty; but there are reasons that support it with a great degree of probability.

First;

First; this is the only passage of the whole Scriptures, where this, or a similar, title is given to the Son; and singularity is, of itself, a reasonable ground of suspicion.

Secondly; instead of, *ο ων επι παντων*, &c. it is suspected that the true original reading was, *ων ο επι παντων*. For it is well known, that the ancient manuscripts are written without any of the marks of breathing now in use. Now it was visibly the easiest thing in the world, for a careless or knavish transcriber, to change it into the present reading, *ο ων επι παντων*. And there was an age, or rather successive ages, when the advantage would be seized with greediness, by a particular party of men, who had long the power in their hands, and defended by all the arts of fraud, and all the terrors of force. Thus the error might become general, and in time the only reading of the manuscripts. Errors less easy to be accounted for have happened; and it is now no secret, that one whole verse * has been foisted into the Sacred Writings, and still deforms and pollutes them in spite of demonstrative evidence, to serve the very purpose, for which this text is so confidently quoted.

* 1 John v. 7.

H

Thirdly;

Thirdly; the very peculiar phraseology is another strong presumption against the present reading. It is, I am persuaded, universal with Prophane Authors to omit the participle; and with the Sacred Writers and St. Paul himself so very general to omit it, in similar expressions, that, supposing him to have meant as you suppose, if the chance had been calculated before he wrote, whether he would have written, *ο ων επι παντων*, or only *ο επι παντων*, it would have been a thousand to one for the latter against the former. From what I have just said of the Sacred Writers, I except St. John, who was more studious of simplicity, than of propriety or elegance of expression. Any person who will take the trouble to consult his Greek Testament, may easily be convinced of the truth of the foregoing observation. To give a few instances. Matt. vi. 1. *τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*; — vi. 9. *Πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. And St. Paul in the very words preceding the text in question, *το κατὰ σάρκα*; and again, in the verse immediately following, *ἐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ*; Eph. iv. 6. *εἰς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ παντῶν, ὁ ἐπὶ παντῶν*. Why not *ὁ ὢν* in this place? If *ων* had no business in this, what had it to do in the other; What should induce him in this particular passage to vary from his usual phraseology, and adopt a manner of expression of neither equal elegance, nor equal emphasis? For the participle *ων* being utterly unnecessary

unnecessary, is an useless load upon the sense, particularly in the last step of a gradation, where energy is most required, and could have been understood here, with more propriety, than in any of the places just quoted. Certainly so mere an expletive would not have been used by "a preacher who gave words only to his ideas, and never sought an expletive to grace, much less disgrace his language, and distract his argument *."

Fourthly; It will not tend to lessen the suspicion, if we compare the different effects the different readings will have upon the context. St. Paul was a writer of a warm, though regulated imagination, and great address. He is here enumerating the great privileges which the Jews had above the Gentile world. This he does by a noble figure, very usual with him, and by Rhetoricians called amplification; and it was not his manner, on such occasions, to leave any thing short; which, in the present case, according to the common reading, he evidently does. For he mentions not the circumstance, that of all others most honourably distinguished the Jews, and stops in the person of Christ; which is not the highest step, to which the gradation may ascend. If we admit the conjectural transposition, this great circumstance is added, and

* Layman, page 131.

the amplification rises to the very highest pitch, from the Son to the Father; from the second person in universal nature, to the one true, and self-existent God, above whom there neither is, nor can be any thing. *I could wish myself accursed from Christ, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites; whose are the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the ceremonial of worship, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and from whom Christ had his earthly generation; whose is the God, that ruleth over all, worthy to be blessed for ever. Amen.* A conclusion strong and sublime, and full of reverence towards him, who is the *blessed and only Potentate, the one God and Father of all, who is over all* *.

I will not say that this is certainly the true reading; I confess I think it probable. If St. Paul had been a Prophane Author, I should have admitted the correction without scruple; more reverence is due to the word of God. It may not, however, be improper for the learned world to give it a mature consideration. If I have been tedious on this text, I hope to be forgiven. It is the only text of the whole Bible, that seems to say any thing for Athanasianism; and therefore merited a full discussion.

* Eph. iv. 6.

Page 130. " Now our Lord Jesus Christ him-
 " self, and God, even our Father—comfort
 " your hearts, and establish you in every good
 " word and work. 2 Theff. ii. 16. Either there
 " are *two* nominatives joined by the copulative *and*,
 " or there is but *one* in the sentence before us;
 " and in that case the copulative unites two spe-
 " cific terms put in apposition to the one general
 " nominative; if the former were the case the
 " verb must *necessarily* have been put in the plural
 " number, whereas from its standing in the singu-
 " lar, we must conceive it governed by one nomi-
 " native only; now, if there be found one term
 " in the sentence including the rest within its ge-
 " neral import, that is the nominative governing
 " the verb; but I have all along asserted, that
 " the Father is God, and that the Son is God,
 " and therefore now say, that the word *God* is
 " here that general term comprehending within
 " itself, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and *even*
 " *our Father*, one God, which *bath* loved us, and
 " *bath* given us everlasting consolation."

I had discovered before, that you had extraor-
 dinary skill in grammar, but did not suspect your
 abilities to be of so prodigious a size. You have
 rescued the English word *bath*, as if it were the
 singular verb agreeing with so many nominatives
 comprized one within another; but the truth is,
 that

that in the original it is no verb, but a participle agreeing, as it ought, with the name of the single person, of whom it speaks; ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγαπηστὰς ἡμᾶς.

Again; your rule is not true, that several nominatives singular joined by the copulative *and*, necessarily require a verb plural. They may have a common verb of the singular number, how many of them soever they may be; and whatever difference of person, of substance, of situation, of qualities they may express, and whether one comprehend any other of them or not. You will not perhaps take my word; but here is the evidence of three unexceptionable witnesses.

— “ Non
“ Te, Torquate, genus, non te facundia, non te
“ Restituet pietas.”

Hor. Ode 7. Lib. 4.

“ Ipsa Pales agros, atque ipse reliquit Apollo.”
Virg. Ecl. Daphnis.

“ Et pater Æneas, et avunculus excitet Hector.”
Virg. Æneid. 5.

Lastly, That blind bard, who blind as he was,
could see as far as some people who have an eye
or

or two to spare, has put no less than four nominatives, of which no one comprehends another, before one common verb of the singular number.

“ Ὅσων ἐφ’ Ὑρμίνην καὶ Μύρσινος ἐσχατόωσα,

“ Πέτρῃ τ’ Ὀλβεινῇ καὶ Ἀλείσιον ἐντὸς ἐέργει.”

Hom. Il. lib. 2. l. 615. 616.

If these four examples do not satisfy you, you might, in a little time, be helped to forty thousand from writers in all languages, of poetry and prose; and thus your fine-spun theory about specific terms, and nominatives and verbs, turns out to be no better than arrant nonsense. For, though Jesus Christ and God our Father, had been not only different persons, but different Gods, St. Paul might, with the greatest reverence for grammar rules, have used the verb παρακαλεσαι in the singular number. In fact, you betray a manifest hankering after Sabellianism; nay, rather effectually “confound the persons,” when you say, that “God is that general term comprehending “within itself *our Lord Jesus Christ, and even our Father, one God.*” For if the persons are different, as (ex hypothesi) they ought to be, here is an instance from the Apostle himself, that ruins your whole process; which supposes that the common verb ought to be of the plural number, when it is referred to two different nominatives of the singular

lar; and if Jesus Christ be one person, and God our Father another person; which you dare not deny, here is the very necessity you have been contending for, two persons of the singular number, of which the one does not comprehend the other.

Page 133. " God was manifest in the flesh,
" 1 Tim. iii. 16."

If by God here you do not mean the Supreme God, this text is nothing to your purpose. For we have seen that the word, *Oeos*, God, is often taken in an inferior sense. If you mean the Supreme God, what sense do you give to *was manifest in the flesh*? If you mean *became visible*, and *was seen of men*, how do you reconcile this with the text that declareth, *No man hath seen God at any time*? But farther, common Christians should not be uninformed, that it is far enough from being certain that (*Oeos*) God is the true reading, Some good manuscripts, and the most ancient versions, made nearest to the times of the Apostles, and to their own country, read very differently, viz. *o That which* or *os He that**; and Sir Isaac Newton, in his second letter to Le Clerc, has come little short of a demonstration, that this word is as shameless a forgery as the spurious verse of

* Wettstein. ad Locum, et Prologomena, de MS. Alex.
pp. 19. 20. 21. &c.

John mentioned above. Men, who know not these things, should not set up for expounders of the Scriptures, lest peradventure they should teach another Gospel; and, those who do, ought to give their reasons why they consider disputed texts as authentic, that unprejudiced inquirers may judge for themselves: Otherwise true Christianity may be argued out of the world.

But I go back to page 128; where I had overlooked something, which I by no means intended to pass by. "The following is an explicit declaration that Christ is both God (you must mean Supreme God) and man: For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Coloss. ii. 9."

It may be a sufficient answer to refer you to the first chapter of this very epistle, above quoted; where the same Apostle having given a most magnificent description of the God-like actions, powers, and dignity of the Son, in a long and well-supported amplification, accounts for them all by this remarkable expression; *For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.* To this I cannot see what reasonable reply can be made, but will not depend upon it alone. I will venture to affirm that our translation very faintly, if at all, exhibits the ideas of the original; that the text is so far from

from containing an "explicit," that it contains no declaration at all, that Jesus Christ is either Supreme "God," or "man."

The Greek words are *ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πάντα πληρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*; and in order to clear up the true sense, it will be necessary,

First, To state the precise meaning of *πληρωμα*:

Secondly, The relation which *θεότητος* bears to it, and the meaning of this latter word:

Thirdly, The exact idea conveyed by the adverb *σωματικῶς*.

First, therefore; *πληρωμα* is a derivative from the verb *πληρω*, which signifies to fill up, or to complete; it is formed from the preterperfect tense passive, and consequently has a passive signification, and means not fullness in the abstract, an inherent and underived fullness; but *that which is added, or put to, by way of making a thing complete*. This precise signification it has, Matt. ix. 16. where we read, *For that which is put in to fill it up (το πληρωμα αὐτῷ) taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse*.

Secondly,

Secondly; The relations of τῆς Θεότητος to πληρωμα can be no more than three. It must signify either, as Grammarians speak, the material cause, that of which the thing added consisted; or the receiver of the added powers, or the giver of them; that is, either the thing filled up, as αὐτὴ in St. Matthew, or that which filled it up. The first is impossible; because the first self-existent cause could never communicate all, or any of his own nature, that, by which himself is God, and which is necessarily in him, to any person whatsoever; and we have proved that πληρωμα means something so communicated. The second relation is equally impossible; because the Godhead is an idea comprehending all perfection and plenitude, to which nothing can be added, and from which nothing can be taken. It remains therefore, that it must stand in the last of the three relations, and signify the giver of the powers received. It may be objected that Godhead is a mere abstract idea, and cannot be an agent. But an agent it is, and can be nothing but an agent in this passage; and therefore Θεότης, Godhead, must, by a very common figure, be put for Θεός, God. In this very meaning τὸ Θεῖον a term exactly synonymous with ἡ Θεότης is used by St. Paul himself. Acts xvii. 29. *Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God we ought not to think, that the Godhead, that is,*

God, *is like unto gold or silver, &c.* Godhead literally taken, is nothing real, but an abstract idea existing solely in the mind, and consequently could never be conceived like to any substance in the universe, material, or immaterial.

Thirdly; *σωματικῶς* cannot signify *in his body* consistently with your sense of the text. For *the fullness of the Godhead, the plenitude of him, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, whose throne is heaven, and whose footstool earth;* could never be cooped in the narrow compass of a human body. And if *σωματικῶς* be understood to mean, in his body, it is a mere redundant word, that expresses no more than had before been expressed by *ἐν αὐτῷ*, in him; except it be contended (which is not possible to be conceived) that the plenitude of Godhead resided not in his mental powers, but in his human flesh. We may fix its meaning, I think, from another passage of the same Apostle, where he says, *who shall deliver me, from the body of this death, ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου* *? Whoever heard of death's having a real body? The body of this death most probably means, the so many concurring causes of death, this army, as it were, of destroyers; and then

* Rom. vii. 24.

σωματικῶς in the present text will mean, *Collectively,*
in one aggregate sum.

Now we may venture to translate, and the true meaning will come out thus; *For in him dwell, in one great aggregate, all those glorious gifts and powerful communications of God, which might compleat him, viz. for the high office and dignity for which he was appointed.*

I have the clearest conviction that, though it be impossible to render the Greek words literally, on account of the very different genius of the languages, I have given the Apostle's meaning very exactly. And if this conviction could be increased, it would be increased by comparing this with the following text of the same St. Paul; *That ye might be filled with all the fullness of God* *, *ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς παν πληρωμα τῷ Θεῷ*. It has been proved, by Acts xvii. 29. that in Paul's Language ἡ Θεότης and ὁ Θεός are exactly equivalent terms; he therefore might have wrote in this last text, *πληρωμα τῆς Θεότητος* instead of *πληρωμα τῷ Θεῷ*; and if he had so wrote, the ideas conveyed would have been the same, as are conveyed by *πληρωμα τῷ Θεῷ*. In the latter text *τῷ Θεῷ* can have no other relation, to speak again in the language of Gramma-

* Eph. lii. 19.

rians, but of the agent to the action; and the purport of the Apostle's prayer, will be this, *That you may effectually be filled with every gift and grace of God, necessary to compleat you, viz. for your Christian warfare, for working out your salvation, and the attainment of everlasting life.*

Page 154. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood. Acts. xx. 28. What can convince, if this be unable? Shall we see the blood of God himself streaming for our redemption, and still deny that God and man are one Christ?"

Pray, Sir, who denied this so positively as yourself? Did you not insist, in one of your preliminary chapters, that Christ was to be divided? And was not I obliged to appeal to your own so much admired creed, to convince you, that the person of Christ is one and not two? And now, who but you for an asserter of the unity of Christ's person? It was then your cue to talk of one Christ, who was God, and another who was man; to affirm that the one Christ knew what the other knew not, and could do what the other was unable. But now, it seems different measures are necessary, and we have you, as I foretold we should, in your
Atha-

Athanasian regimentals, as spruce and trim, as if your frock had never been soiled, and you had never blushed to wear it. Now the person of Christ is so inseparably one, that what he could suffer only as man, one of the greatest infirmities of human nature, is attributed to his "greater nature;" and we are called upon to "see the blood of God himself streaming for our redemption. A while ago, as man, he was ignorant, but now he can bleed as God." Some of your brethren, however, are provided with a Christ, that can, and another that cannot bleed; and it is a pity you had not equal foresight; for depend upon it you will make but an awkward figure with your "bleeding God."

The blood of the Supreme God you must mean. Shall Jesus Christ decide the matter for you? He tells you, *that God is a Spirit* *, and *that a Spirit hath not flesh* (and consequently no "blood") nor bones †. If you will not take the word of Jesus Christ, dare you really give the lie to your beloved articles; the first of which positively asserts, that "the one living and true God is without body, parts, or passions," and consequently bloodless? He therefore, from whom "blood" so copiously "streamed," could not be "the one living and

* John iv. 24.

† Ibid. xxiv. 39.

" true

"true God:" Or, if he was, will you still fight so like a Quixote, for so false a Dulcinea, as you must now own these same articles to be?

After all, you must agree that the *blood of God* is a very singular expression, and not very reconcilable with either Scripture or reason, and might have known, that there are manuscripts of good authority, and versions of the highest antiquity *, that read the *Church of the Lord, or the Church of Christ*; one of which, one may, I think, conclude with certainty is the true reading. But no matter; it sounded cleverly on your side; and sound is something where nothing more substantial can be had.

Page 181. "Grace be unto you, and peace from him which was, and which is, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits, which are before his throne, and from Jesus Christ, Rev. i. 4, 5."

In your comment on this text, you *assure* us that these seven spirits are also God; and this you prove in a most extraordinary manner; thus; "the seven spirits (you must mean metaphorically understood) are the eyes of the Lamb; and to find

* Wetstein ad Locum.

"favour

"favour in God's eyes, is to find favour with
 "God: Therefore the eyes of the Lamb are the
 "Lamb himself," that is, the seven spirits are the
 Lamb: This it is to be master of one's craft; a
 bungler might have puzzled for a month, and at
 last have owned the necessity of yielding poor
 Lindsey this point at least. But, with your Bible
 in your hand, you can work wonders; take it up
 therefore again, and read Rev. v. 6. you will there
 find (if words are capable of meaning) that the
 seven spirits are not put figuratively for the seven
 eyes of the Lamb, but the *seven eyes for the seven
 spirits of God, sent forth into all the earth.* The
 seven spirits therefore are the Lamb's ministers;
 and they are called his eyes by the plainest meta-
 phor in the world, in perfect conformity to the
 custom of the Asiatic nations, who called the King's
 ministers the King's eyes, but surely never mistook
 them for the King himself.

It turns out therefore, that "spirits" are not
 put for "eyes," but "eyes" for "spirits," and
 thus all your fine reasoning is vanished into smoke.
 But I will not yet cry shame; you shall have your
 own way, and the Lamb's eyes shall be the Lamb
 himself, provided you grant the Lamb to be Jesus
 Christ. What then will you make of the sacred
 text? Why, you introduce the good old Apostle,
 in

in the plenitude of his inspiration, delivering this blessing to the churches of Asia; "Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which was, and which is, and which is to come, and from Jesus Christ, who is before his throne, and from Jesus Christ." Now I will cry shame; and I really think you will have the conscience to take some little, at least, to yourself.

There are two passages of your book, in which you seem to triumph much; and which, for that reason, I have reserved to be considered here. The former is at page 166. "But the word of God (here seated on a horse, and declared to be Jesus Christ himself under that appellation) is expressly said to be God." You allude to John i. 1. "Jesus Christ therefore being that word manifest in the flesh, and that word being God, Jesus Christ is therefore one with the Father God."

You must mean, as I have observed before, that the Father is Supreme God, and the Son Supreme God; otherwise you are not patching up the breaches of the establishment, but utterly overthrowing it, under the mask of mighty zeal for its defence. Not to stand with you for little points, it shall be granted, that by Λόγος, the word, is meant Jesus Christ. What then? Why then Jesus Christ,

Christ, or the Son, is Supreme God. Pray, Sir, not faster than good speed. The text runs thus; *In the beginning was the word, (Jesus Christ) and the word was with God, and the word was God.* But God in both clauses means Supreme God; now there are either two Supreme Gods, or but one Supreme God. You will not say there are two; therefore God in both clauses must mean one and the same Supreme God. The Apostle's narrative therefore will stand thus; *Jesus Christ was in the beginning, and Jesus Christ was with the Supreme God, and Jesus Christ was the Supreme God, with whom himself was*; that is, Jesus Christ was the Supreme God, associated with, and accompanied by himself. But one would hope you would be cautious of saying this for the sake of common sense.

Again; you will not deny the Father to be Supreme God: Substitute therefore *the Son* instead of *the word*, and the text will read thus; *the Son was with the Supreme God*; that is, with the Father, *and the Son was Supreme God.* There is, however, but one Supreme God; therefore the Son was the Father. I would not advise you to hold this sort of language publicly, for fear of a disaster from malapert children in the streets, who, as Horace informs you*, are sometimes not over civil to maintainers

— Vellunt tibi barbam.
Lascivi pueri; — Sat. III. Lib. I.

of paradoxes. One would not think a prudent man would be greatly eager to introduce such confusion into every department of human speculation, to countenance the laying of such a foundation for universal scepticism, and the making a perfect chaos of the human mind. Thus shocking are the effects of prejudice, and above all of religious prejudice. It is, however, peculiarly unkind to press the words of this venerable Apostle into this cruel service; for he has been particularly careful, through all his writings, in language the most plain, the most simple, and the most decisive, to aver the Son's inferiority to the Father: If therefore this text does really contain so strange a proposition, he seems to have wrote his whole Gospel with the express purpose of confuting it; and the most that can be proved by it, if no consistent meaning can be found, will be that we do not understand it.

There is, however, no necessity of recurring to this supposition. Various interpretations have been given by different Unitarians; of all of which you ought to have proved the impossibility or improbability, before you had argued from a sense, which, after all, may not be the sense of the Apostle. This you have not done, and therefore plainly begged the question; a sort of proof, that
of

of all others does the least honour to a logician ; because it absolutely proves nothing, and amounts to neither more, nor less, than saying it is so, because it is so.

Without meaning to disparage other interpretations, some of which, I am sure, may be grammatically defended, I intreat you to attend to the following observations. We read, *Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the Elders of Israel ; and they saw the God of Israel.* This God of Israel could not be the Supreme God, because we are assured by St. John, by St. Paul, and by Jesus Christ himself, who lived many ages after Moses and Aaron, that *no man hath seen God at any time ; ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape* †. If it should be enquired who was this visible God of Israel, Moses may be allowed to explain himself, who, in the preceding chapter, has recorded these words, *Behold I send an Angel before thee—My name is in him.* Though, therefore, it should be granted that ὁ Λόγος, the word, denotes the person of Christ, yet it will by no means follow, that θεός, God, in the third clause, denotes a person of equal power and perfections with τοῦ θεοῦ, God, in the second clause.

† John i. 18.—v. 37. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

The original Greek term for God, in the second clause, is dignified with a mark of pre-eminence, which is wanting in the third; where, however, the fundamental rules of the Greek language seem absolutely to require it, if the contrasted terms were meant to express equality of different persons; if God, in each clause, were God in the same super-eminent degree, with a sameness or equality of attributes and perfections. It has been proved that the title of God is given to many persons, in the Holy Scriptures, infinitely inferior to the one true God and Father of all; and it is most certain, that if the Apostle had really intended, in two words, to oppose supremacy to subordination, he must have used the very terms he has used, *τὸν Θεόν* for the former, and *Θεὸς* simply for the latter.

According to the idea therefore suggested by these remarks, for the truth of which I appeal to all competent masters of the Greek language, the Apostle's meaning will turn out to be this; *In the beginning was Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ was with the Supreme God, and Jesus Christ was God in a subordinate and limited sense, dignified with this title because he was God's Vicegerent in the great work of creation, as he was afterwards in the merciful work of redemption, and still is in the administration of God's providence.*

The

The other text is page 149. "And we know
 "that the Son of God is come, and hath given us
 "an understanding, that we may know him that
 "is true, and we are in him that is true; even in
 "his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and
 "everlasting life. 1 John v. 20. It is remark-
 "able that this declaration is followed by a desire
 "to keep from idols, to the overthrow of whose
 "worship, he preaches the Godhead of Jesus Christ,
 "the Son."

The interpolation of the English word *even*, and
 the ambiguous translation of the Greek preposition
ἐν, have indeed thrown some obscurity on the Eng-
 lish text; but an expositor should be ashamed of
 being misled by any translation whatever, especially
 in so plain a text. Thus it ought to be read ver-
 batim; *We know that the Son of God is come, and
 hath given us an understanding, that we may know him
 that is true; and we are in him that is true, ἐν τῷ
 υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ by or through* (the mean-
 ing of the preposition *ἐν* in a thousand places) that
 is, *by the ministry of his Son Jesus Christ. This—*
 What this? surely he that is true, *to the knowledge
 of whom we are brought, in whom we are, whose
 people we are become by the ministry of his Son
 Jesus Christ—This is the true God and everlasting
 life; in exact conformity with the declaration of*
 Christ

(72)

Christ himself, recorded by the same Apostle; *This is eternal life to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent; thee as the giver, and Christ as the minister of eternal life.*

There is another text indeed quoted by you, but either not insisted on, or, which I think hardly possible, overlooked by me, and that is the baptismal form, Matt. xxviii. 19,

This text has been brought into this controversy as of itself almost decisive; I will therefore say one word to it. To baptize in the name of a person, it is said, "is to ascribe Supreme Divinity to that person, as it is paying him the highest divine honour." Did St. Paul consider it in this light? *I thank my God, that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I baptized in my own name*.* What such an one as Paul the Aged afraid, that, if he had baptized some half dozen, or ten converts, he might have been mistaken for the Supreme God? Of him that thinketh so, I will say nothing, but the wag in Theocritus would have said,

"ὦ μοι τῷ πάγωνος, ὃν ἀλθίως ἀνεφύσας."
 Theo. Idyll. X. Ver. 40.

* 1 Cor. i. 14.

The

The Supreme Godhead of Jesus Christ has often been inferred from that *worship*, which he permitted to be paid to him during his residence on earth. This argument has been urged to myself, though there is something exceedingly childish in it. We find in Scripture that even men were worshipped without any imputation of blame to the worshippers. In fact, allowing for the different circumstances of time and place, our ceremony of putting off the hat is perfectly similar. The conduct of Cornelius to Peter, Acts x. 25. may seem to put this matter out of all doubt. Cornelius knew Peter to be a *man*, at least certainly not to be God; and being a *devout man*, and *one that feared God*, could never mean to pay an honour to a creature, which was the known due of God alone. Peter refused the worship, possibly out of modesty or civility; more probably, because he would give Cornelius to understand, that his obligation was to God only. *Stand up*, says he, *I myself also am a man*, and, like you, have acted only in obedience to God's very particular command. You owe therefore nothing to me.

I have now gone through all the texts I proposed to consider. You may perhaps expect that an answerer should travel with you step by step, and refute in detail every thing you have advanced. For this I had neither leisure nor inclination; and really

L

I am

I am persuaded, this is an honour you are never likely to receive. You seem to have precluded it effectually. You have so cut and flashed the Scriptures, have mashed them, if I may borrow a word from good old Latimer, into such a *mingle-mangle*; you have tacked together so many texts and scraps of texts, that seem to look with astonishment at each other's faces, have deduced such strange inferences from such strange premises, by the aid of so many childish conceits, so innumerable sophisms, so many violations of the rules of logic and grammar, that he must be a bold man indeed, who shall venture to dissolve all these unnatural alliances, to restore every word to its true sense and place, to detect and expose every thing false and ridiculous, to re-establish dethroned common sense, to remove the mighty mountain of deformed rubbish, that fell down while you were employed in the visionary labour of erecting a fortress on the surface of a fog.

He who shall undertake all this, will undertake an Herculean task, and I heartily wish him the double patience of a Grizzle and a Job. It is sufficient for me, that I have picked up the most valuable materials, and arranged them properly again in that edifice, for whose ornament and strength they were originally intended, and which you had deformed

deformed by wrenching them away. In fact, Sir, I flatter myself that I have fairly fetched off most of your capital texts; that, to vary the metaphor, I have routed your main phalanx, and I am not much concerned about your light-armed troops. It must happen here, as it does in more serious engagements, when the *flos* and *robur exercitus* no longer support them, these can make no defence; and, as during the conflict they look both ways, are always glad to follow the victory.

You will observe, that I have entered no farther into the controversy between you and the worthy and excellent Apologist, than the unity of the Godhead in the person of the Father is concerned. Whether any, or what sort of worship is due to the Son, is a most important question in Christianity, which I leave to the discussion of some person who has more leisure and better abilities to discuss it; only remarking, that, if the Son is not Supreme God, it cannot be right to worship him with the worship due to the Supreme God alone. If worship is due to him at all, St. Paul seems to have drawn the line, that it should ultimately be referred to the glory of God the Father.

If I may declare my own sentiments, I so far differ from Mr. Lindsey, that I do not think it

“ sinful” to pay such worship to the Son, as to his high office of God’s Vicegerent, and those god-like powers and perfections with which the Father has invested him, may seem suitable. This question I long to see yet more largely discussed, and be the result what it will, am sure it will promote the interests of religion, and tend to make the gospel better understood, and give it a wider diffusion through the world. The discovery of truth can never do harm to a true religion.

But the person for whom the honour of finally deciding this question is reserved, must possess other talents, and arts of controversy, than distinguish your performance; a clear and steady head, courage to own the truth, wherever he finds it, great mastery in the original languages, and a complete knowledge of the Scriptures. Above all, he must be free from that outrageous and fiery zeal, which flashes like the explosion of a meteor, and dims the eyes of the understanding by its glare.

In the mean time, whatever doubts may arise upon this question, it is, or may be, clear enough to an unprejudiced enquirer, that you have defended an indefensible hypothesis. If the suffrage of reason may be taken, it decides with mathematical

tical and intuitive certainty, that the Athanasian doctrine is not true. And of this you seem to be conscious yourself, from the abundant pains you have taken to represent human reason as a mere *ignis fatuus*, a false light, that will plunge its followers in a quagmire, or precipitate them from a rock. This, however, is not speaking with too much reverence of the gracious God, who gave it; and appointed it the only guide of all mankind, in all the most momentous concerns and enquiries respecting the happiness of the present life; and of a vast majority of mankind, for much the greater number of ages; nay, even of a considerable majority at this day, in all the more momentous enquiries respecting the life to come. Men might abuse their reason, or mistake its powers, and deceive themselves; but it is a hard thing to say, that God laid them under a necessity to follow a blind guide, that could not but deceive them.

If an appeal is made from reason to the bar of Scripture, that pronounces with equal certainty, that there is but one Supreme God, and that the Father only is he; except the Sacred Penmen have not written in the common language of mankind, and their words stand not for the same ideas as in the common intercourse of men. If they do not, enquiry is at an end, and we can never be certain,

in

in any one sentence, that there is any meaning at all.

If the Scriptures therefore speak so positively, nay, even though their language were not quite so peremptory, it seems to be high time to take some measures towards abrogating that usurped authority, that has so long dictated in matters of faith, that forbids Christ to be the only King in his own kingdom; that tempts by rewards, and deters by penalties, his subjects from their allegiance; that tells them, virtually at least, that, if he has not, he ought to have ordained so or so; that fallible men can set forth the mind and will of God in words more proper and expressive, than it has been set forth by the infallible Spirit; an authority, that with equal right may be claimed by all governments, and would consequently carry us back to Popery, and from Popery to Paganism.

While the present doctrine that three Supreme Gods are but one Supreme God, makes a part of our Church establishment, I cannot see, I confess, how transubstantiation can be confuted. What is there in that hypothesis more shocking to reason and common sense? Is it not as intuitively decided by reason, that three are not one, as that a spiritual is not a *Breaden* God? The sacrifice of reason is equal in both cases; and if it is once acknowledged

ledged that reason is no judge, where it has the
 clearest perceptions, the light of it is utterly ex-
 tinguished. The Emiffaries of Rome are not igno-
 rant of the advantages afforded them by this Pro-
 testant constitution, nor backward to improve
 them. With this weapon in their hands that dex-
 trous Militia make the most successful inroads into
 the territories of the Reformation. You object,
 says the crafty Priest, that transubstantiation can-
 not be true, on the assurance of your senses and
 your reason; but these you have already given up,
 when you admitted the doctrine of the Trinity on
 the authority of revelation, interpreted by your
 own Church. I ask no more; I require no greater
 sacrifice. The authority of my Church is as good
 as that of your's, and, if numbers and antiquity
 add weight, much greater. As for revelation, it
 is no where said in all the Scriptures, that the Fa-
 ther, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one God;
 whereas, I alledge the words of Christ himself for
 the truth of my doctrine, who expressly said "*this*
 "*is my body.*" To this argument what can a
 simple Protestant reply? He feels that his eyes have
 been put out by his own establishment, and thank-
 fully gives his hand to one, who courteously pro-
 mises to lead him, and, at the same time, speaks
 with such confident boasting, of the infallibility of
 his Church.

There

There is another reason for wishing to apply some remedy to so cruel and inveterate an evil. It is visible that the torrent of vice and profligacy is bearing down all before it; and it is equally visible that the present mode of dispensing the Gospel is unable to stop it. There is indeed but too much reason to suspect that the establishment itself affords some countenance to this general corruption of manners. For while that affirms it to be the *first duty* of a Christian, a duty necessary above all others, so necessary that he who fails in it, "shall without doubt perish everlastingly," to believe what neither is, nor can be the object of belief; it is easy to conceive how the merit of so strong a faith, required under so dreadful a sanction, is likely to operate. When the sinner has once persuaded himself that he has it, he will be apt to balance it against many relaxations of his spiritual discipline, depending on the great security of all, his exalted faith; thus he will become gradually careless of, what would require much labour and mortification, the regulation of his thoughts and appetites, of bringing his whole body and soul into subjection to the obedience of Christ.

But even this is not the worst of those dismal consequences, that have followed this desertion of the inspired Scriptures, and investing human conceits with Divine authority. Already a large part
of

of sensible but not sufficiently serious men are become Infidels: Surely therefore it becomes those, whose particular concern it is, maturely to consider how far our present plan is calculated to check this prevailing apostacy. These men desert, because every human establishment they examine revolts their understanding; and they will seek Christianity no where else, while they are told they may find it there, in its true features, delineated and ascertained to their hands. This way of seeking information, however in reality inexcusable, affords a plausible pretext for their desertion, and as they flatter themselves, justifies them to their consciences. For this evil there can be no remedy, but the public disavowal of human decisions, and sending men for the learning of Christianity, directly to the Scriptures. In these genuine records the honest and unprejudiced among them would find it not only the most amiable, but at the same time the plainest and most intelligible religion, that ever was professed among men.

The blessed Author of it preached to the poor, and chose them preferably to men of higher stations and accomplishments. If he had taught in the strain of Athanasianism, I beg to be informed, what unlearned hearer would have been edified, or believed to salvation? Indeed not the unlearned only, but the most improved understanding upon earth,

earth, never did, nor ever can reconcile the Athanasian doctrine to common sense. The Souths, the Bennets, the Waterlands, the Sherlocks, and Wallis's, and a long list besides, all undertook to explain this inexplicable doctrine, and the consequence was, that they disagreed utterly in their explications, and hung millstones, not designedly indeed, about the neck of Christianity; some making three, some four, and some but one God; some even leaving it dubious, whether they made any God at all. Nay, some were so whetted in the dispute, that they pronounced Anathemas on their opponents *, and if they had held the temporal sword, would probably have proceeded to the effusion of blood,

If these champions of orthodoxy are so little at accord, it may be enquired, "what must common Christians do?" If there is a doctrine of Christianity so necessary to be believed, that without the belief of it we must "perish everlastingly," and if this very doctrine is in itself so obscure and abstruse, that all the study, and all the learning of the best informed and most dignified divines, has never yet been able to settle the very point which is required

* Witness the censure pronounced by the University of Oxford against Dr. Sherlock's explication.—Lindsey's Apology, page 64.

to be believed; what, I ask again, must the common Christian do? One is prompted to cry out, the Lord have mercy on him. The Lord has had mercy on him, and given him a revelation, in which, if he do his duty to himself, he will be sure to find salvation, though the name of Athanasius, or of any of his discordant expositors, shall never come to his ears.

Let him go to his Bible, and take religion as his Saviour left it. There he will find that there is one God the Father, and that there is no other but he; that this gracious God sent his beloved Son into the world, to teach mankind a most pure and animating religion; that *he raised him from the dead, and highly exalted him*, in reward of his obedience, to a kingdom and power, which he must hold and exercise till the consummation of all things, and then resign to God who gave it; that he still sends his Holy Spirit to strengthen him in weakness, and comfort him in distress. This every man can understand, and this is all that the Scriptures teach, or require to be believed with regard to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Let those who think themselves wiser than God, and undertake to amend his language, enjoy their prejudice, or presumption, but let them not lay stumbling blocks in the way of their more cautious brethren, nor pronounce them reprobate, for choosing to

take their ideas of God from the written word, and it only. Though Christianity is not likely to become the general religion, till the personal unity of God is generally acknowledged, yet, in the mean time, both parties may ensure their own salvation; if they walk in brotherly love, and are careful to work it out by such knowledge as both are agreed in. *To their own master both parties must stand or fall*, and neither hath the smallest authority to judge the other, except what is derived from *the Powers that be*, whose object is only the affairs of this world.

This controversy must be decided by the inspired Scriptures alone, and human authority set entirely out of the case; yet perhaps the authority of Clemens Romanus, the scholar and successor of Peter the Apostle, may fairly be considered as something more than human. If any man, whose writings are come down to us, could know the true doctrine of the Apostles, he is most to be depended on. He, however, has presented us with no Athanasian Trinity in his excellent epistle to the Corinthians. On the contrary, says this venerable father, exhorting them to unity and concord, *We have one God and one Christ*. Could he thus formally have distinguished God and Christ, if he had believed Christ to be God, in the highest sense of the word? Can words more positively express that
 God

God is *one*, and Christ *another*? He concludes with this truly Apostolical benediction and doxology, “ *The grace of Christ Jesus our Lord*, be with you, “ and with all in every place, who have been called “ of God through *him*.” God the caller, Christ the instrument, by whom he called; surely he thought them not the same. “ By *whom* (Christ) to *him* “ (God) be glory, honour, might, majesty, and “ everlasting dominion for ever. Amen.” How unlike the conclusion of modern sermons, “ Now “ to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to “ *him* (one good Dean has said to *them* *) be ascribed all might, majesty, dominion and power?”

I have all along supposed you to be serious, and really believe you to be so; but you have made so many ludicrous applications of texts of Scripture, and your whole performance is so strongly marked with the features of burlesque, that this belief requires no small effort of charity. You have indeed afforded plentiful matter to Infidels and Scoffers to exercise their talents of ridicule, and if this could fall on yourself alone, it is no more than you justly deserve. But these men will not discriminate; they will take things as you represent them, and turn their wit prophanelly on the Scriptures, which your indiscretion has prepared for

* Dean of Gloucester's lately published Sermons; page 54.
their

their purpose. You will not, however, be persuaded, that you have hung up Christianity as a laughing-stock for fools and profligates. It is visible you triumph in your imaginary "confutation" of Mr. Lindsey, and possibly, as the noted Giant-killer never rested while there was a Giant in the land, may be prompted, by the pride of victory, to attack the other, as you will account him, most Heretical apologist *. If this should happen to be the case, pray, Sir, take the trouble to fix ideas to your words, and to make your ideas consistent. With this serious and friendly advice, I bid you most heartily farewell.

* Benjamin Ben Mordecai, whose Apology was, some of it, published in the course of the last year; a work fraught with learning and good sense.

POSTSCRIPT.

P O S T S C R I P T.

PAGE 124. "Who being in the form of God,
"thought it not robbery to be equal with
"God; but made himself of no reputation, and
"took upon him the form of a servant, and was
"made in the likeness of men; and being found in
"fashion as a man, he humbled himself and be-
"came obedient unto death, even the death of
"the Cross. Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8."

I did not consider this text in its due course, be-
cause it carries in it such evident proofs that Jesus
Christ is not the Supreme God, that I could hardly
conceive it possible for the most negligent reader
not to see them. But as you say, "If this text
"stood without another to support it, it is con-
"clusive for the Godhead (meaning Supreme God-
"head) of Jesus Christ," and as there may pos-
sibly be readers as prejudiced as yourself, I will
here give it a particular examination.

The

The Greek words of the sixth verse, on which the Apostle's argument turns, are these. 'Ος ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχων, ἐχ' ἀρπαγμαὸν ἤγησατο το εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ. You endeavour to prove that ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπαρχων, *being in the form of God* is the same as if the Apostle had said *being God*, i. e. *Supreme God*; and you take it for granted that ἐχ' ἀρπαγμαὸν ἤγησατο is rightly translated, *thought it not robbery*. Putting therefore your sense on both expressions, let us try what can be made of the Apostle's words. You must consider the words *being Supreme God* either as containing the reason, why Christ thought it no robbery, or the circumstances in which he thought it none. On the former supposition St. Paul speaks to this effect, *who, because he was the Supreme God, thought it no robbery*, considered it as no act of injustice or usurpation, *to be equal with the Supreme God*; but steadily insisted on his right.—Softly, good Sir; St. Paul says directly the contrary, though, if the sense of the former part of the sentence were rightly assumed, he could have said nothing but this.

On the latter supposition, the sentence will run thus; *Who, though he was Supreme God, yet thought it no robbery to be equal with the Supreme God*. Such sense, nay, rather such nonsense, could never be uttered by inspiration. But let us go on, and consider

sider the Apostle's view; he is recommending hu-
 mility by the example of Christ. Thus, therefore,
 according to you, he argues; " Let this mind (of
 " humility) be in you, which was also in Christ
 " Jesus, who, though he was the Supreme God;
 " yet considered it as no act of injustice or robbery
 " to be equal to the Supreme God; *but*, on the
 " contrary, emptied himself, and, instead of con-
 " sidering it as a matter of wrong or robbery, to
 " be equal with the Supreme God, became a man
 " of the lowest and most despicable condition, even
 " a slave." It really surpasses my comprehension
 to conceive, what exercise of humility there could
 be in our Saviour's taking himself to be, what he
 really was, the Supreme God; and if there is not
 some condescension expressed in the preceding ne-
 gative clause, what can the unlucky particle *but*
 have to do in the following? Is not this represent-
 ing the Apostle as affirming, that Christ shewed no
 humility of mind, at the same time that he shewed
 an humility inconceivably great?

Besides; if Christ were the Supreme God, by
 what means did he cease to be so? How was it
 possible, that he, who holds all his attributes by
 the necessity of his nature, should divest himself
 of them, should *empty* himself and sink to the con-
 dition of the meanest and most distressed of man-
 kind? The thing is absolutely impossible, and St.

N

Paul

Paul could never say it. If by "made man" you mean that he "took the manhood into God," as the Athanasian Creed informs us; then he was so far from being debased, that he was made, in how-ever small a proportion, greater. For whatsoever is added must make some increase, and the human powers added to the Divine must render them either more in number, or greater in efficacy. But this again is impossible; for he, who has all possible perfection, cannot be made greater, and if he could make himself so, it would be no mark of his humility.

When you tell us that "God was actually man," meaning the Supreme God, that "God was made "man," pray, Sir, do you mean to stand by the Nicene Creed, and to exclude the Athanasian, which asserts the contrary, viz. "that the God-head was not converted into flesh," or "made "man," but "that the manhood was taken into "God?" So bare-faced a contradiction must, one would suppose, be not a little mortifying to so warm a defender of the present established forms. You may take whether proposition you please, but both cannot be true; though a profession of the belief of both is commanded to be made in the so-lemnest manner, in the face of God, and his con-gregation, on the same day, within the same half hour, under the penalty for the disbelief of one of them,

them, so far as human authority can inflict it, of eternal damnation. When one witness deposes in direct contradiction to another, surely those are hardly used, who are compelled to avouch the veracity of both. It is indeed equally impossible that the Supreme God should be made man, and that man should be made Supreme God, or indeed any part of him, who has "no parts." To bind men therefore to the belief of these two Creeds, at least as you understand the word God in both, is binding them to the belief of the strangest medley of contradictions. Have a little charity therefore, I beseech you, for conscientious men, who solicit relief against so grievous an oppression.

Though it be certain enough that you have grossly misinterpreted the Apostle's words, yet perhaps it is not equally certain what his precise meaning was. The text has exercised the talents of many able critics, and still there may be some doubt whether any of them have fully succeeded. Among such names I am little ambitious of mixing mine; yet hope it will not look presumptuous, if I submit to the public judgment the idea, which the original words have raised in my mind.

The great difficulty lies in the word *ἄρπασμεν*, which is generally supposed to signify actively, *ipso actio rapiendi*, *the very act of seizing*. If the

word is taken in this sense, all the foregoing absurdities will follow; and therefore St. Paul certainly meant it not in this sense. The word itself so seldom occurs, that there is no fixing its meaning from other authors; though the kindred term ἄρπαγμα, and even ἄρπαγμα ἡγεῖσθαι, is frequent enough. If the words in this place had been ἄρπαγμα ἡγήσατο, the meaning would have been clear, non, ut prædam, arripuit, non prædam sibi duxit, *he considered it not as a thing, which he had a right to seize, and hold fast as his own.* In this very sense, it is probable that the Apostle used ἄρπαγμα, and the indefatigable Wetstein has quoted one place at least where ἄρπαγμα must be so understood. For my own part, I have sometimes suspected that ἄρπαγμα may possibly be a passive adjective of that sort of signification, which adjectives in *bilis* and participles in *dus* have among the Latins; and in this case, the meaning of the expression would be indisputably determined to the same effect, as has been just set down.

Theocritus has said,

“ Ἐυφ’ εἶμα βρεφὲα γλυκερὸν καὶ ἐγερσιμον ὕπνον.
 “ Idyll. 24. line 7.”

“ Sleep

“ Sleep my babes, a sweet, and (if one may say so “ in English) a wakeable sleep.” I suppose, therefore, ἀρπαγμα to be formed as a passive adjective from ἀρπαζω by the same kind of analogy as ἐγερσιμος from ἐγείρω.

But be this conjecture right or wrong, if ἀρπαγμα is equivalent to ἀρπαγμα, as indeed there can be little doubt it is in this passage, the text will prove as strongly as possible against the Athanasian Trinity; and that, whether the word God be understood of the Father, or of the Son. It appears to me to be more eligible to understand it of the Son, and the absence of the article is not unfavourable to that interpretation. What that μορφή Θεοῦ, that *form of God*, that divine state and character, was in his original undiminished glory, may be conjectured from those amazing splendors that surrounded him at the transfiguration. *We beheld*, says St. John, who was one of the three disciples present at this wonderful transaction, *his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*. Great as these splendors were, I conceive the Apostle to represent him as not eager to retain them, when he could accomplish so benevolent a purpose, by suspending his possession of them, as bringing mankind to everlasting salvation. His argument will proceed thus; *Who did not think that*
he

he ought, as it were, to lay firm hold on that Godlike dignity, so as never to give it up; to seize it as a matter of indispensable consequence to be always the same great and stupendous Personage (το εἶναι ἰσα Θεῷ); to preserve a perpetual equality of that inconceivable majesty, which he had being yet Θεός, not ὁ Θεός, next to the Supreme God, the most glorious being in the universe; but emptied himself of all this, and took μορφήν δούλου, the form and character of a slave; in which character he was seen, when he became obedient to the servile death of crucifixion. Thus the same person, who at one period of his existence, had been the representative of the Father's glory, whom all spiritual created intelligences beheld with distant wonder, at another, became a most miserable and despised man, an unjustly condemned and dying convict, that he might reconcile apostatized mankind to God. Here every thing is real, clear, intelligible, glorious, and amazing. What an example of humility? Who will not be made truly humble by motives so irresistably endearing?

Page 192. "Father if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me," and—"knowing that Jesus Christ died for our redemption, I hereby perceive the love of God, because he laid down his life for us. 1 John iii. 16."

It

It is amazing that a man, who undertakes to explain Scripture to his ignorant brethren, should himself be so ignorant. The word Θεῶς, God, is a manifest interpolation, being found in but one Greek manuscript out of about sixty, used by Wetstein *, and that of a low age, and very bad authority. Of printed editions of any repute, it is only to be found in the Complutensian and Genevan, and of versions the modern English only has it. But there is no occasion to appeal to manuscripts, editions, or versions, to reprobate the word. It is impossible St. John should have wrote ἐξελυος, for the pronoun He, referred to an antecedent immediately preceding. Either he would have used no pronoun at all, or if he had thought proper to use one, αὐτος must have been the word. There is a use of the Greek pronoun ἐξελυος very frequent in all authors, when they mean to mark out a person with particular emphasis, without naming him. This, and no other, must be its meaning in this passage; and these are the words of the Apostle literally translated, *By this we have known love, that he* (Jesus Christ emphatically denoted) *laid down his life for us.*

* I do not mean that all these MSS. had the Epistles of John, but that it was wanting in all, that had them, except one;—and these are all the known MSS. of the Catholic Epistles.

At page 95, where you quote Coloss. i. 16, 17, by way of proving that Jesus Christ has the same attributes with his God and Father, it might have been observed, that every expression in the original seems to be decisive of his inferiority, by exhibiting him as the Father's minister. The words are, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα—τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐκτίσται—τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνεστήκε. The prepositions ἐν and διὰ never, I think, express primary independent agency. To convey that idea indisputably, the Apostle must have used the preposition ὑπο, or perhaps παρὰ; ἐν and διὰ meaning, ordinarily at least, the agency of a minister, a person employed under the controul of a first mover. This, therefore, I take to be the sense of the original words; *by his ministration all things were created—all things have been created by his ministration—by him, that is, by his ministration all things* (the whole universe, if you please) *consist, cohere, and continue as one regular connected system.* You, however, seem to be one of those, who choose not to hang their faith upon an ἀπο or an ἐπι, though the true sense of all language depends, in a very great degree, on the right understanding of its particles. The innumerable blunders you have been drawn into by the English translation, must entirely ruin your reputation as a scholar; or if you really knew better,

better, and gave an undue preference to the translation, because it was most for your purpose, you have been your own enemy in a still more material respect.

But the worst part of your ill luck, in adducing this passage as a proof of your proposition, has not yet been pointed out. It will ruin your favourite distinction of two natures in Christ, and consequently the whole Athanasian hypothesis, irretrievably. For, how say you, Sir? shall we impute this wonderful work of creation to Christ in "his greater nature," as he was God; or shall we consider him as having created all things in heaven and in earth, in "his less nature," as he was man? It behoves you to make a deliberate choice. If you say the former, then here is what amounts to the positive assertion of an inspired Apostle, that Christ, in his greater nature, is inferior to the Father: For we are told, in the words presently following, that he effected this greatest of his mighty works by the *fullness*, which it *pleased the Father* to confer upon him; which communication of the Father would have been both unnecessary, and impossible, if Christ had been absolutely perfect before. If, on the contrary, you say, that he created all things in heaven and in earth, as he was man; then you cannot mean that he had any concern in the original

O

creation,

creation, which was past, many ages, before he existed in his human nature. On this supposition, you give a Socinian sense to the words, and add one more to the list of Heresies, that have already been proved upon you, having quoted the passage to no kind of purpose whatsoever.

ADDENDA

A D D E N D A, &c.

S I R,

ONE would hope that the man, who undertakes to give a strict *mathematical demonstration* of this proposition, "The Son is one with the Father, God," is not well aware, that a mathematical demonstration is a series of propositions, every one of which, is either intuitively certain, or has been before proved by some medium intuitively certain, and finally producing infallible certainty in the consequence, a certainty that precludes all possibility of objection. If this be so, what must be thought of the pretended Demonstrator, whose last step is to this effect; "It may be objected, that this proposition is not contained in the Holy Scriptures in so many words; and if it be so objected, we can only answer, that we presume, but cannot prove, that it was taught *verbally* by the Apostles?" What must we not think of him, if his adversary can reply, as in this case he truly may, "There is no reason to presume that such a proposition was verbally

“ taught by the Apostles, because the contrary is
 “ expressly and repeatedly affirmed in their writ-
 “ ings, viz. that the Father, personally distinguish-
 “ ed from the Son, is the only true God?” Have
 you really no remorse, when you charge so flat a
 contradiction on the inspired Apostles of our blessed
 Lord, when you suppose their verbal preaching to
 have been directly contrary to their written in-
 structions?

But farther; did you hear the Apostles verbally
 deliver such a doctrine, or can you produce the
 evidence of any credible witness who did? If not,
 surely it is not fair to suppose a matter of fact, of
 which there is no more proof, than of a thing
 that was never yet conceived to exist. But grant-
 ing at last that the Apostles, in their verbal preach-
 ing, used such a form of words, what will be the
 consequence? The words Father and Son in their
 mouths either were terms of human language, or
 they were not. If they were not, we can know
 nothing at all of the ideas intended to be conveyed
 by them, because they have come down to us ut-
 terly unexplained. If they were terms of human
 language, we must understand them as they mean
 in human language; and then, *if the Son can be one*
with his Father, by the very same analogy, the
daughter may be one with her mother; and by the
strictest consequence, all the men, and all the wo-
 men,

men, that have existed upon earth since the first parents of mankind, are but one man, and one woman; and thus truth, and reason, and common sense are, by one bold stroke, exterminated from the earth,

I am far from charging this consequence to your intention, but it necessarily follows from your premises. The time however may come, when even you may look back to the present day with sincere regret, when you may be heartily ashamed of some imputations you have cast on Mr. Lindsey, and feel compunction for the poisoned daggers, which you have stuck in the moral character of an amiable and venerable Prelate: It is possible that you may sometime know experimentally, how indissoluble a bond knits the truly Christian Spirit to God's faithful word, and cease to wonder, that it despises all the commandments and interpretations of men, which pretend to controul or contradict that infallible instructor. I say this with the greater hope, because I have known conversions, every way as improbable, brought about by time and cool reflection; your prejudices may grow weaker, and maturer judgment extinguish the fire of your present zeal, and that youthful temerity which now prompts you to court popular applause, by capering on the edge of a frightful precipice. If however I am mistaken in this charitable hope; if either

you

you desperately resolve not to see the danger, or from some incurable defect in your optic organs cannot see it; in either case, *as you may for age live forty or fifty years, you will probably then have the unenviable honour of being the solitary admirer of your own achievements. For light is gone abroad, and shines too clearly to be now smothered; except the world should again relapse into the barbarism of the thirteenth century *.

But to drop these reflexions, what at present I wish to do, is to add something, by way of confirmation, on a few topics not so fully insisted on be-

* In that century the Council of Lateran, which gave the first establishment to the Athanasian Creed, was held by Pope Innocent III. who likewise procured the establishment of its sister absurdity, Transubstantiation. Both these were worthy of men and of times, illiterate to a degree almost inconceivable. Of these men, and these times, a most respectable Historian now living has remarked, "that many dignified Ecclesiastics "could not subscribe the Canons of those Councils, in which "they were members." And the Pope himself was so ignorant, that, in a solemn harangue, he derived the Hebrew word *Pascha* (Passover) from the Greek verb *πασχω*, signifying to suffer. See Benjamin Ben Mordecai's first letter, page 35, where he quotes Robertson's history of Charles V. and where much useful information will be found on this subject. So excellently were they qualified for forming articles of faith, and binding their decisions on all future ages.

fore,

fore, and to consider a few passages of your book, which seem peculiarly calculated to prejudice the cause of truth, by alarming or misleading the weak or ill-informed.

At page 31 of Remarks, the Greek words ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ ἑρῶνῳ are translated who *was* in heaven, the context necessarily requiring that it should be understood as expressing a thing past. Authorities are there produced, that such is its signification in other places of Scripture, and to these I now add the following authorities of the most approved Classics, which prove to a demonstration that the participle of the present tense is used of a thing prior to the time of the verb. “Hiempfal etiam antea *Despiciens* ignobilitatem Jugurthæ — dextra Atherbalem affedit. Sallust. Bell. Jugurth. Hiempfal, who *had* before despised the meanness of Jugurtha’s birth, seated himself on the right hand of Atherbal.”

ὁ ὢν

Θανοι μεν αὐτος, την δὲ ΤΙΚΤΟΥΣΑΝ λιποι

Τοις οἰσιν αὐτε, δυστηνον παιδεργιαν.

Soph. Odip. Tyr. 1270.

“By whom himself was slain, and left me to his own son, to be made an unhappy mother by him,
whom

whom *I brought forth.*" Ἐι τις θεωρεῖ τον τροπον, δι'
 ὃν μεγας γεγονεν, ἀσθενης ΩΝ τοκαταρχας, ὁ Φιλιππος.
 Demost. Olynth. 3. p. 125. Mounteney's Edition,

"If any one consider the means, by which Philip,
 who *was* originally weak, is become powerful."

The argument (page 36, of Remarks) to prove
 the present to be a tense of all times, may be closed
 by an authority, which you will hardly venture to
 gainsay, that of the Sacred Writers themselves,
 by whom it is frequently used to express both past
 and future time. Thus says St. Matthew, xxvii. 24.
 Ἰδων δε ὁ Πιλατος ὅτι ἔδειν ΩΦΕΛΕΙ, αλλα μαλλον
 θορυβος ΓΙΝΕΤΑΙ, λαβων ὕδωρ ἀπενίψατο τας χειρας.
 When Pilate saw that he *prevailed* nothing, but
 that rather a tumult *was made*, he took water and
 washed his hands, St. Mark also thus uses this
 very verb εστι, ii. 1. Καὶ ἠκησθη ὅτι εἰς οἶκον Ε'ΣΤΙ
 and it was noised abroad, that he *was* in the house.
 We find the same idiom twice in one chapter of
 St. Luke, καὶ ἐζητεῖ ἰδεν τον Ἰησουν τις Ε'ΣΤΙΝ,
 xix. 3. and he sought to see Jesus, who he *was*. And
 εἶπε παραβολην διά το — δοκειν αὐτοις ὅτι παραχρημα
 ΜΕΛΛΕΙ ἡ βασιλεια το θεο ἀναφανεσθαι. 11. He
 spake a parable unto them, because they thought
 that the kingdom of God *was* immediately to ap-
 pear

pear. In the same Evangelist the present is put for the future tense, no less than three times within the compass of four verses, as will appear to any one, who will read verses 33, 34, 35, 36, of the twentieth chapter.

At page 73 of the first edition of the Remarks, I have inadvertently done you some injustice, by supposing that you argued from that worship, which Jesus Christ received while he conversed on earth, to a proof of his Supreme Godhead. How I fell into this blunder might be naturally enough accounted for, but I choose to confess that I ought to have been more careful; and hope criminality will not be imputed, where nothing but fair dealing was intended. I must however have leave to think, that your whole argumentation, grounded on those prayers, and that worship, which you suppose the Apostles and their contemporaries addressed to our Lord after his ascension into heaven, is extremely inconclusive. Let it be supposed (for I mean not to dispute this point with you) though not granted till better proof appear, that they did pray to him, and worship him, not *visibly present*. It appears to me, with the most convincing evidence, that it was impossible for them to do either, as to the one Supreme God. They knew indeed that he *had all power in heaven and in earth*, but

P

they

they knew also that this power was not originally his own, but *given him by the Father*. On this account they might pray to him, as commissioned to hear and grant their petitions, but they could never conceive of him as that God, who gives all things, and can receive nothing; *as made perfect by sufferings* *, though necessarily immutable and impassible; as a God, who *both died and rose and revived to this end, that he might be Lord both of dead and living* †, though he had been Lord of all things from everlasting, and nothing could depose him from his dominion.

That the Scriptures allow an inferior kind of worship to be payed to a person inferior to the Supreme God, is decisively proved by St. John's behaviour to the Angel. Rev. xxii. 8. *I John saw these things and heard them; and when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the Angel, which shewed me these things*. St. John confessedly knew the person, whom he meant to worship to be not Supreme God; the Angel had informed him of his true character; yet with all this conviction on his mind, he makes a tender of that, which if it were idolatry, was deliberate on

* Heb. ii. 10.

† Rom. xiv. 1.

his part, and not the less sinful, because it was rejected by the Angel. Is it possible, that he, whose whole long-extended life had been spent in propagating the knowledge of the one true God, and of the honour due to him alone; to whom so extraordinary illuminations of the Holy Spirit had been vouchsafed, for the very purpose of breaking down the strong holds of idolatry; to whom the woes, which are finally to overwhelm idolaters, had just before been exhibited in such a variety of terrifying representations, should close the scene of his life and preaching, with an overt act, utterly repugnant to all ideas of true religion, with a deliberate tender of divine honour to an acknowledged creature?

The Angel however, you may reply, rejected the offer. Can therefore no reason be given for this rejection, but that he thought it sinful for the one to give, and the other to receive the offered worship? Yes; the Angel himself gives a most satisfactory one. *See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the Prophets.* He, who gave commission to me, has given the same to thee also; and thus we are upon a level, being made joint and equal ministers of the same glorious dispensation. *Worship God* therefore, who

has made thee a chosen vessel to himself, to whose good pleasure, the great honour of this appointment, which sets thee in the rank of angels, is solely due.

But Jesus Christ was worshipped not only by men on earth, but by angels in heaven. It will not therefore follow, that Jesus Christ is Supreme God. The account, which Holy Scripture gives of this matter, is in these words, *When he bringeth the first-begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him.*—*Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever* *; *a scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom: Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows* †. Is the Son equal to his God and Father, who rewarded him with this pre-eminence for his love of righteousness, and hatred of iniquity, who thus commanded the angels to worship him to express his own approbation of his singular merit? *Without contradiction the less is blessed of the greater; he who received, is inferior to him who gave.* The angels knew for certain, that he, who

* Or, *God is thy throne for ever and ever*, which is more literal.

† Heb. i. 6, 8, 9.

called for this recognition of his authority to appoint, was greater than the person appointed by him; and consequently the honour, of whatever kind it was, was not paid to Christ as Supreme God, but as a token of their acceptance of, and acquiescence in the ordinance of the Father, to whom they owed the happiness and glory of their own angelic state, and whom they had worshipped long before the first-begotten was brought into the world.

The conjecture, that ἀρπαγμος (page 92 of Remarks) may possibly be a passive adjective, seems to receive farther confirmation from a passage in Xenophon's Cyropædia, lib. 6. where we read that Cyrus, having invented a carriage of a new construction, to be drawn by eight yoke of oxen, for the purpose of conveying towers, *πειραν ἐλαμβαντα ἀγῶγους*, made a trial how far the drawing of it was practicable.

I now come to one or two more of your texts; and first, for the spurious text of John. "I do believe, "you say, the 7th verse of the 5th chapter of St. John's first Epistle, to be at best a very dubious "text—But I shall beg leave to express myself in the "words of it—In my own person, then I say, "that I believe in the Father, the Word, and the
" Holy

“ Holy Ghost, and these three are one.” Page 148, first edition.

Really, Sir, it is a most pitiable case, that, when you had the choice of such a multiplicity of unscriptural formularies of faith, you have chose so badly; I mean, that you could not hit upon one, that would better express your own hypothesis. For the Greek of this text, such as it is, says no more than this, “ There are three that bear witness “ in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy “ Ghost, and these three are not *is*, but *éiv*, not “ one God, but one thing, or one testimony, or “ agree in one thing, one testimony, viz. *the testi-* “ *mony that God gave of his Son.*” All this therefore may be true, and yet the Father may be the one true God. If indeed you may be allowed to eke out the forgery by a false translation, then it will come up to your purpose, when that which was only a lie originally, is metamorphosed into absurdity. But be all this as you will, let the meaning of the words be ever so clear on your side, it is surely a mighty civil compliment, which you pay to the impious falsifyer of God’s Holy Word, when you adopt his spurious terms for the formulary of your faith, and seems pretty openly to insinuate, that he, who belied the Holy Ghost, has more of your regard, than the Holy Ghost himself. Free leave however have you, to express
yourself

yourself as you please. A man of a more diffident spirit may be inclined to give the preference to Holy Scripture; and it is hoped he may have the same leave, to which he has certainly a better right, to express his faith in words, which assuredly cannot be wrong, because they were uttered by God's infallible Spirit, who positively affirms that there is no true God, but the *Father only*.

At page 157, of your first edition, we read as follows; "Jesus Christ reveals himself to St. John
 "in the following words, These things saith the
 "first and the last, *which was dead and is alive*.
 "Rev. ii. 8. God says to Isaiah, I am the first and
 "the last, *and besides me there is no God*. Isa. xlv. 6.
 "Hence we see that, besides the first and the last,
 "there is no God. But Jesus Christ says, I am
 "the first and I am the last; the conclusion is,
 "that besides Jesus Christ, one with the Father,
 "there is no God."

The logical conclusion, as you, disregarding one half of the words, have chose to understand the text, and according to the hypothesis which you adopt of different persons, can only be, that besides Jesus Christ, *who is not the Father*, there is no God, and consequently that the Father is not God. But you must bear to be reminded, that this expression of St. John, *The first and the last, which*
was

was dead and is alive, bears not the most distant resemblance to this expression in Isaiah, *I am the first and the last, and besides me there is no God*. The latter may be a proper description of the one true God, and the former be totally incompatible with all his attributes. Let us take all the words into the account, and look at your argument through the medium of a syllogism.

HE, who in Isaiah styles himself *the first and the last*, is the one true God, *besides whom there is no other*, who, as St. Paul informs us, *alone hath immortality*, 1 Tim. vi. 14, 15, and cannot die.

BUT Jesus Christ, in the book of Revelation, styles himself *the first and the last, who was dead*.

THEREFORE, Jesus Christ, *who was dead*, is the one Supreme God, *who could not die*.

A paltry Logician, of the stamp of a Chillingworth, or a Locke, would have brought out a directly contrary consequence, and have said, "Jesus Christ, *who did die*, is not the Supreme God, *who could not die*." If therefore, the text had been left in common hands, what a misfortune would Orthodoxy have suffered? The pestilent Unitarian Heresy would have lifted its head aloft, and have added this to the numberless other passages

pages

sages of Scripture, that directly assert the Son's inferiority to the Father. Common men are equal to common occasions; but a desperate situation is the ground, where extraordinary genius displays itself. Of this you have here afforded a notable instance; an obstruction seemed to be in your way, as impregnable as a brazen wall, but you passed through with as small an effort, as an elephant would sweep away a cobweb.

One thing, however, you have forgot, which may easily be set right in your third edition. I mean you may then inform us, what became of the universe and all its complicated machinery, while the Supreme God, he, *who could not die, was dead*. For my own part, I should have thought, that, if he, whose infinite power and infinite wisdom are necessary to its existence in every moment, had been dead, "chaos must have come again," and a new creation, of which, however, we have no account, must have been necessary. Till therefore, you have cleared up this difficulty, which I doubt not you can do as effectually, as you have many others, I shall take the liberty to suppose, that the *first and the last* who could not die, and the *first and the last* who did die, are very different Beings; so different, that the latter is entirely dependent on the former; that with regard to the former, *first and last* respect time and duration, with regard to

Q

the

the latter rank and condition, as it is said in the gospels, *the first shall be last, and the last first*. I conceive, therefore, the now glorified Son of God to speak to this effect; "I, who expired in the character of a slave upon the cross, am now raised by the good pleasure of my God and Father, to dominion over every gradation of beings in the universe, *Angels, and authorities, and powers being made subject unto me* *, *who am myself subject unto him, who did put all things under me* †."

This is the last of your Scripture-proofs, with which I mean to have any concern, and I must intreat you seriously to review it. If you take it by the handle, which you have fitted to it for your purpose, it proves that the Father is not Supreme God; if you take it by the handle given to it by the Sacred Writers, it proves, beyond a possibility of reply, that the Son is not Supreme God; and take it by whatever handle you please, it will prove that you are more anxious for the fate of your hypothesis, than for the honour and consistency of God's Holy Word.

Though I meddle no more with your Scripture-proofs of the Trinitarian doctrine, I must here take the liberty of a full and free expostulation, with

* 1 Pet. iii. 22.

† 1 Cor. xv.

regard to two charges brought by you against Mr. Lindsey.

For the first; He tells us, you say *, "that all "Christian people, for upwards of three hundred "years after Christ, till the Council of Nice, "were generally Unitarians." Yes, Sir, he does tell you so; but he does more; he informs you where you may find it proved by "accumulated "evidence." This evidence you ought at least to have confuted, before you had accused him of "bold and unsupported assertion." But it was more for your convenience to blast his reputation as a falsifyer, if haply your attempt should succeed, by a contrary assertion, bold in the highest degree, and supported by nothing at all, but the assurance of the man who makes it. You could not be ignorant, at least you ought not to have been ignorant, that the question here regarded solely Ecclesiastical history, posterior to the times of the Apostles; and your business was to bring some proof from authentic writers of those times, that the Trinitarian was then the general doctrine. This being the true state of the question, the opinion of the Apostle John is quite beside the purpose; and though you pretend, on his authority, to take away "the first of these three centuries,"

* Layman, page 153.

this, as I trust it sufficiently appears, is mere matter of imagination, much like the feat of the facetious Knight, who boasted of *peppering* so many of the rogues in buckram, though his rapier was stained by no blood but his own. You have indeed laid lustily about you with your Sophistical cudgel, but if any livid tumours have been the consequence, they will be found on your own shoulders only, who have not produced one text that proves any thing to your purpose, and so many that prove directly against it.

One cannot, however, be surprized at your uneasiness at this part of Mr. Lindsey's book: For it will go a great way to overthrow the whole of your's. If, as you grant, the Trinitarian doctrine is not expressly taught in the Scriptures; if also it was for so long a time so little known among the primitive Christians, here is the strongest presumptive proof, that it had not been taught verbally by the Apostles; and consequently that there is no proof at all for it, except such as may be extracted from the written records, by the racks and tortures of such an Inquisitor, as you have shewn yourself to be *.

Your

* When a proposition is to be deduced from another, supposed to contain it by implication, it can be done only by just reasoning

Your other charge is, that the Apologist has
 “ bestowed nearly half his book to instill prejudices
 “ favourable to his cause” (p. 2.) What therefore
 are those prejudices, which he has inculcated with
 such “ superfluous diligence?” Why, it turns out,
 that he has written a chapter on the diabolical per-
 secution

soning. Some people, however, have a trick of stumbling in
 the steps of their argumentation, and even of shutting their eyes,
 lest they should meet with something unpleasing in the prospect.
 If you are discovered to have done the one, or both of these,
 you must excuse men, who desire to walk circumspectly, and
 to see where they set their feet, if they cannot give you entire
 credit. Certainly it is but an awkward kind of supposition,
 which admits that, what you would call the first principle and
 main pillar of Christianity, is left for Christians of all sorts of
 understanding to deduce for themselves, as well as they can, from
 premises so doubtful, that the generality of them for a long
 course of time, and a large part of them in all times, missed of
 a truth, of all others the most necessary. Three or four words,
 which are now no where to be found in the Sacred Writings, if
 they had been expressed but once in any part of them, would
 have put the matter out of doubt; and it is the more wonderful
 they were not, because the Scriptures are granted to be suffi-
 ciently explicit, with regard to all other points of faith or prac-
 tice, points confessedly of vastly inferior consequence. That
 the first Christians really knew little or nothing of your favourite
 doctrine, there is the greatest reason to believe, and you must
 by no means be allowed to call it *a bold and unsupported assertion*,
 till you have invalidated all the authorities referred to in the
 following quotation. The writer of the letter, from which it

secution of those, who suffered unto death for the Unitarian doctrine. This, it seems, is an unfair attempt to prejudice his readers, and send them with a bias on their minds to the consideration of his Scripture-proof.

Mr,

is taken, knew what he said, as well as any man, and possibly you may find it the hardest task you ever did, or ever will engage in, to convict him of tripping. "I was mistaken in directing you to Eusebius for the matter you wott of. You shall find it in a witnesse much farther from exception herein than Eusebius, even Athanasius himselfe, the greatest adversary of that doctrine, and Hilary, who was his second. See the first in *Ep. de Synodis Arim. et Seleuc. p. 917. D. Tom. 1. Edit. Paris. 1627.* See the second *de Synodis, Fol. 97.* In the first you shall find, that the eighty Fathers, which condemned Samosatenus, affirm'd expressly, that *the Sonne is not of the same essence of the Father*; which is to contradict formally the Council of Nice, which decreed *the Sonne co-essentiall to the Father.* In the second, you shall find these words to the same purpose, *Octoginta Episcopi olim respuerunt ad Hæmouision.* See also, if you please, *Justin. cont. Tryph. p. 283, 356, 357.* Tertull. against Praxeas, c. 9. Novatian *de Trinit. in fine*, who is joined with Tertullian. Athanas. *Ep. de fide Dion. Alex. T. 1. p. 551. Basil. T. 11. p. 802, 803, edit. Paris. 1618.* See St. Hierom, *Apol. 2. cont. Ruffinum. T. 11. p. 329. Paris, 1579.* See Petavius upon Epiph. his *Panar. ad Hæc. 69, quæ est Arii. p. 285*; and consider how well he clears Lucian the martyr from Arianisme, and what he there confesses of all the ancient Fathers.

If

Mr. Lindsey had before maintained, that the first Christians, the immediate successors of the Apostles, were for a long time generally Unitarians; that this was the faith of a great part of the Christian world; till racks and executions had made it terrible, to a degree not to be resisted by human

“ If you could understand *French*, I would refer to *Perron*,
 “ p. 633, of his reply to King James, where you should find
 “ these words: *If a man should demand of an Arrian, if he*
 “ *would submit to the judgment of the Church of the ages prece-*
 “ *dent to that of Constantine and Marcian, he would make no dif-*
 “ *ficulty of it, but would presse himselfe, that the controversy*
 “ *might be decided by that little, which remains to us of the*
 “ *authors of that time. For an Arrian would find in Irenæus,*
 “ *Tertullian, and others, which remaine of those ages, that the*
 “ *Sonne is the instrument of the Father; that the Father com-*
 “ *manded the Sonne in the works of creation; that the Father*
 “ *and the Sonne are a^{ius} et aliud; which things he that should*
 “ *now hold, now when the language of the Church is more ex-*
 “ *amin’d, would be esteem’d a very Arrian,*

“ If you read Bellarmine touching this matter, you shou’d
 “ find, that he is troubled exceedingly to find any tolerable
 “ glosses for the speeches of the Fathers before the Councell of
 “ Nice, which are against him; and yet he conceales the
 “ strongest of them; and to counterpoyse them cites authors,
 “ that have indeed ancient names, but such, whom he himselfe
 “ has stigmatiz’d for spurious, or doubtful, in his book *de Scrip-*
 “ *Ecclesijs*,

“ Were

human fortitude. It was then no wonder, that the contrary doctrine was generally professed. Yet was it never so universal, but some intrepid spirits were found, who dared to forsake *Father and mother, wife and children, nay, life itself* for the love of that, which appeared to them with the fullest

"Were I at leisure, and had a little longer time, I cou'd refer you to some, that acknowledge Origen's judgment to be against them in this matter. And Fisher in his answer to Dr. White's nine questions, has a place almost parallel to that above cited out of Perron.

"In a word, whoever shall freely and impartially consider of this thing, and how on the other side the ancient Fathers weapons against the Arrians are in a manner only places of scripture, (and those now, for the most part, discarded as impertinent and unconcluding) and how in the argument drawne from the authority of the ancient Fathers, they are almost always Defendants, and scarce ever Opponents; he shall not choose but confesse, or at least be very inclinable to believe, that the doctrine of Arrius is either a Truth, or at least no damnable Heresy.—See Facundus Hermianensis, lib. 10. c. 15." Life of Mr. William Chillingworth prefixed to the 10th edition of his works, pp. iv. v.

Here seems to be pretty good authority for asserting, that the Christians of the three first centuries were *generally* Unitarians, nor perhaps would he be mistaken, who should suppose that the Nicene Fathers themselves were Unitarians, equally at least with some, who are now upbraided with the name.

left evidence of truth, and of importance so infinite; whom no terrors of this world, no pains, nor shapes of death could overawe into a disavowal, or dissembling of the conviction of their conscience. This is manifestly another link in that chain of argument, which is closed and compleated by his ap-

R

peal

It is certain that by the term *ὁμοουσιος* they meant not the *same numerical*, but only the *same generical* substance, that is, that as, in the human nature, the son is of the same human substance with his father, so Jesus Christ is of the same Divine substance with the self-existent God, though not, like him, self-existent: With this meaning, they opposed it to the term *ἡτεροουσιος*, on one side, which expressed the Arian notion, and to *μονοουσιος* and *ταυτουσιος*, on the other, which conveyed the idea of the Sabellians, allowing the Father to be the cause of the Son's existence, and such an *inequality* between them, as between *Giver* and *Receiver*, *Cause* and *Effect*. This is either granting Supremacy and Priority to the Father, or, to me at least, it is talking jargon; but after all, this rage for defining was nothing better than excess of folly. As the scriptures have not said one word about the substance of the Son, (I speak with respect to those Unitarians, who admit his pre-existence) and human reason, for want of data, is unable to take a single step; men may wrangle and abuse one another till doomsday, and still the matter must remain covered with its original darkness, known only to God, and to those superior intelligences, to whom He may have vouchsafed the means of knowing it.

The opinion of Alexander of Alexandria, who began the contest with Arius, which raised so mighty a tempest in the Christian world, and occasioned the most horrid butcheries and massacres,

peal to the Holy Scriptures. For though it will not follow from the sufferings of those renowned heroes, that they were certainly in the right; yet, something of no little consequence will follow, viz. that the sufferers saw the evidence in an irresistible light, and that their barbarous murderers saw it not

factes, was indisputably Unitarian. It may be read in Dr. Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, lib. 3. p. 180, 181, as recorded by Theodoret in words literally translated as follows. The Son—"is inferior to the Father, only in that he was not unbegotten—as the Lord himself taught us, saying, *my Father is greater than I.*" Mr. Burgh says Christ's inferiority respected only his human nature. Is Mr. Burgh consistent with Alexander, or would he have been accounted orthodox in Alexander's diocese? Again; "there is a wide distance between the unbegotten Father, and the things which were created by him out of nothing (*ἐκ οὐκ ὄντων*)—*ὡς μεσσηύσα*, intermediate between which (the unbegotten Father and the things created by him) *the only begotten Nature*, by which (*δι' ἧς*, by whose ministry) the Father of God the Word made the universe out of nothing, was begotten from the self-existent Father himself." He who will say, that this *μεσσηύσα φύσις*, this middle nature, is one and the same with, or equal to, the unbegotten Father, may with as good reason say, that it is one and the same with, or equal to the things which were produced out of nothing. The middle is in the same relation to both extremes. Such was orthodoxy at the beginning of the fourth century; towards the close of the eighteenth her features are all changed, and not a champion of her youth would couch a lance in her defence.

"The

not in a weak one, when they thus publicly acknowledged, that the profession of the contrary tenet could not be secured, but by a sort of argument, utterly contradictory to the humane and merciful Spirit of the Gospel.

There seems, therefore, to be nothing either impertinent or unfair, in the exhibition of these shock-

"The difference, Dr. Jortin remarks, between Alexander and the Semiarrians seems not to have been great, yet Pachomius, the Monk, had a revelation, which directed him to follow the doctrine of Alexander. *Such was the testimony, which God gave to the pure and orthodox faith of this holy Prelate, who was soon to be attacked by the calumnies of the Arians.* Tillemont. H. E. vi. 216. If this be true, a man may be orthodox, without coming fully up to that standard of orthodoxy, which was fixed in later ages. Monsieur Jurieu, whose zeal against Heresy is well known, assures us that the fundamental articles of Christianity were not understood by the Fathers of the three first centuries, that the true system began to be modelled into some shape by the Nicene Bishops, and was afterwards *immensely improved and beautified* by the following Synods and Councils, that is, by the Jurieus of the fourth and fifth centuries. Thus did this warm and imprudent writer make concessions as large and liberal as his adversaries could desire, and deliver himself up to be buffeted by the Socinians, whom he treated as the vilest of all Heretics." The Jurieu of our times will probably take a different route; and in spite of their own most express words, prove, in his way, that the Christians of the three first centuries, were in all points Pseudo-Athanasians.

ing scenes; But if there is, you have profited by the example, and so far as a frightful assertion can do the business, have provided for your readers a plentiful fund of prejudice of the most efficient kind, to ensure a decision in your favour. When at your very outset, you affirm, that the Apologist's "design was to assail every fundamental doctrine of the Church, to degrade the God of our salvation, and to snatch from us the object of our religion," you could mean no other, than to terrify weak and ill-informed men, by an apprehension, that, if they were not convinced by your arguments, they might as well turn Infidels, and rest their future hopes on God's uncovenanted mercies. This, it must be owned, is a capital manœuvre; this laying of a stumbling-block on the very threshold, is an honourable proof of the dexterity of the craftsman, though not of his boasted impartiality.

It would have been soon enough in all reason to pronounce this damnatory sentence, when you had made out your main point; because, if you have failed in that, as to unprejudiced judges you may now appear to have done, Mr. Lindsey can have done no harm by delivering the simple truth. If your fundamental doctrine be the fundamental doctrine only of a political church, the sooner such a foundation is not *assailed* only, but shaken and
 erased

erased, the sooner the glorious Gospel will be restored to its powers, and lay hold on the hearts and consciences of men. Let us suppose your point to have been proved: It can be proved to those only, who see the evidence; and in that case the Trinitarian doctrine may be true, and yet it may be false that the disbelief of it will be attended with any such fatal consequence, to those who after their best endeavours, after the most attentive study of the Sacred Writings, and an honest application of the "common notions written "by God in the hearts of all men*," see no reason to believe it. I will venture to affirm, that, independently on the truth or falshood of the Trinitarian doctrine, the supposition, that appropriates the privileges and advantages of the Gospel to such a belief, is contrary to Scripture, and consequently false. I call upon you for a single passage, that puts the salvation of mankind upon a belief, that Jesus Christ is the very same one true God, as his God and Father. If you do produce one, I will then intreat you to reconcile it, with those numberless texts, which promise everlasting life on very different terms.

When our Saviour asked his Apostles, *whom say ye that I am?* Mat. xvi. 16. Was the answer, thou

* Chillingworth, page 15, edit. 10.

art Christ, the one true God? No, Sir; *Simon Peter answered and said, thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.* That this answer was fully satisfactory, and fully expressed the character he sustained, we may be assured from the warm approbation given to it by him, who best knew himself, and the errand on which he came. Thus it follows immediately; *Blessed art thou Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven.* What did the Father reveal from heaven unto Simon Peter? That Jesus Christ was the *Son of the living God.* Will you now say, that Mr. Lindsey, and other Unitarians, believe not all that Peter here declared, all that was thus particularly revealed to him from heaven; that they cannot heartily make confession of their faith in the very same words? I answer for them, they can, and do. What foundation of the Church of Christ therefore can they assail, who hold fast the very faith, which derived upon Peter this signal benediction of his Lord and Master?

You may suppose that Peter had other ideas in his mind, than those expressed by the words Father and Son, and that our Lord understood him according to such ideas. This would be to you a very convenient supposition, and thus you might prove any thing from any thing; if for the sake of making out your point, you might be allowed to

to give to words arbitrary meanings of your own; but, at the same time, if you insist on imposing your sense on other men, it will be a falsifying of the record, which God gave of his Son; and whether a matter, deservedly so criminal in courts of human judicatory, can be innocent in the most righteous court of heaven, judge you. There cannot however be greater absurdity, than supposing, as in this case you must suppose, that these words, *thou art the Christ the Son of the living God*, are equivalent to this expression, *thou art the living God, whose Son thou art* *.

Our Saviour goes on; *I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* You will do a most kind office, as well as shew yourself most dextrous in the management of your weapons, if you will explain how the salvation of those can be in danger, so far as it depends on believing, whose faith is that solid and impregnable foundation, against which no machinations or powers of hell shall prevail.

This matter may be set in a still more convincing light. If you will take the trouble to consult the

* If *God* and *Son of God* are equivalent terms, then Adam was God; for of him it is written, *which was the Son of God.* Luke iii. 38.

Sacred Writers, with regard to the subject matter of enquiry at the solemn tribunal of our righteous Judge, you will find, that no man shall be examined whether he believed Jesus Christ to be the one living and true God; but whether the religion he taught by the Father's authority had due influence upon his life and conversation, in bringing forth the fruits of righteousness, holiness, and active benevolence; and whoever is found so qualified shall receive his inheritance in the kingdom prepared by the Father.

Again; the Scriptures inform us, that God is no respecter of persons; but that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him *. Can he, that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, that is, that he came from God, and accepts the rule of life and manners promulged by him in the Father's name, and under the sanction of his authority, want any motive to fear God and work righteousness? What greater motive can he have, who mistakingly believes Jesus to be God himself? The motive and the sanction are the same to both; to both the veracity of the Supreme God is equally engaged for everlasting life, or everlasting destruction, as their obedience or disobedience

* Acts x. 34.

respectively

respectively may render them fit objects of pardon, or punishment.

This false step, in the very first page, was no good omen with respect to the rest of your voluminous performance; and the unfavourable presages it occasioned have been abundantly verified by the event. It would be wonderful indeed, if any service could be done to rational religion, such a religion as is alone worthy of God to reveal, and of man to receive, by a reasoner, who absolutely disclaims reason, who attempts to explain away one of the surest methods *, by which we arrive at certainty, when applied to invalidate certain theological propositions, which he is previously determined to maintain. On this kind of argumentation mathematical science depends; and if in one case it afford strict and irrefragable certainty, the same cause must produce the same effect in all similar cases, that is, wherever the mind has equally clear perceptions. If you deny this consequence, it is incumbent on you to give a better reason, than you have already given: It can be overthrown by nothing less clear than itself is, and if you can bring such a proof, you will have the honour of reducing mankind to a most hopeless and pitiable condition; you will leave them without

* The argument ad absurdum. Layman, page 202.

certainty, without probability, in all cases whatsoever. To set up such a principle, and yet attempt to reason is *cum ratione insanire* * in its full extent.

The great hero of Protestantism, the incomparable Chillingworth, had other sentiments of the prerogatives of reason. He availed himself so effectually of it, in conjunction with the other great Protestant maxim, the sufficiency of Scripture alone, that he gave Popery its death-wound, from which it never yet has, nor ever will recover, notwithstanding the various cordials prepared for it by the theological chemistry of numberless most diligent and affectionate practitioners. In his estimation, reason bore the stamp of Divine authority, and to be contrary to reason was a certain evidence of falsehood †. On this solid rock, your narrow-bottomed

* To be rationally mad.

† “ Whether your requiring men, upon only probable and
 “ prudential motives, to yield a most *certain* assent unto things
 “ *in human reason* impossible—be not a fair way to make them,
 “ that understand themselves, believe neither Church nor Scrip-
 “ ture?” Chillingworth, p. 13, 10th edition. “ If you mean
 “ by discourse *right reason*, grounded on Divine Revelation and
 “ *common notions* written by God on the hearts of all men—it
 “ is very meet and reasonable, and *necessary*, that men, as in
 “ all their actions, so especially in that of the greatest impor-
 “ tance, the choice of their way to happiness, should be left
 “ unto it.” Idem, page 13. “ You agree with one consent,
 “ and

bottomed theory cannot stand, and accordingly having accommodated it with convenient foothold of more pliable materials, you pride yourself in a vain imagination of the strength and symmetry of an edifice, which neither flood nor tempest shall beat down, but the gentlest breath of the feeblest adversary annihilate.

I had intended here to close your account, but cannot resist the temptation you have thrown in my way at your 220th page. We are there told, "that nothing can be more absurd than the idea of a progressive religion, which being founded on the declared, not the imagined will of God, must, if it attempt to proceed, relinquish that revelation, which is its basis, and so cease to be a religion founded upon God's word."

Can you be ignorant, that this very case is affirmed to have happened, that every establishment of religion in the world is supposed, by proceeding

"and settle it as a rule unquestionable, that no part of religion can be repugnant to reason." Page 17: To this rule he gives his own hearty concurrence, and only blames his adversaries, the Papists, for acting contrary to it. Again, page 45. "What should hinder, but that that prayer, *Lord cleanse thou me from my secret sins*, may be heard and accepted by God, from a Protestant, that holds some error, which, as he conceived, God's word, and his *reason* (which is also in some sort *God's word*) led him into?"

farther than it ought, to have more or less "relin-
 quished revelation, which ought to be its basis,
 " and consequently has so far ceased to be a reli-
 gion founded on God's word?" What in such
 a case is to be done? When such aberrations are
 discovered, is it fit or right to suffer them to con-
 tinue, and impede the blessed effects of the Gospel?
 Is it not manifestly the duty of every Christian, of
 Christian ministers in particular, who have engaged
 their solemn promise before God, "that they will
 " be diligent in reading the holy Scriptures, and
 " in such studies as help to the knowledge of the
 " same, and that they are determined out of the
 " same Scriptures to instruct the people committed
 " to their charge, and to teach *nothing* (as required
 " of necessity to salvation) but that which they
 " shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved
 " by the Scripture *;" is it not, I say, the duty of
 such to exert all honest endeavours, that the chaff
 may be separated from the wheat, all debasing mix-
 tures from the pure and precious word, however
 they were introduced, whether by the weakness
 or wickedness, the ignorance or self-conceited wis-
 dom of former times? Errors are not usually de-
 tected all at once, and when they are, it is not fit
 that the rest of mankind should renounce them on
 the word of the detector: Time will again be ne-

* Form of ordering of Priests.

cessary for patient examination, and at last it is more than probable, that inveterate and darling prejudice will prevail over suspected truth, with respect to a great majority. Thus the improvement of religion once corrupted, if it is effected at all, must be effected by slow degrees, and "the idea of progressive religion," if by religion you mean, as you ought to mean, the knowledge and practice of its truths, is not so absurd as you choose to suppose. At the time of the Protestant reformation, some important points were not inquired into at all, and some truths lay under such odious imputations, that the minds of the Reformers recoiled at the very contemplation of them, while others again, of which they were well convinced, were consigned to neglect, because the temporal powers beheld them with an evil eye, and would suffer religion to be nothing, but what themselves, not always the most competent judges in the case, approved; with regard to all or most of these, the same obstructions, in a greater or less degree still subsist, and if ever they are removed, the removal must be gradual, and religion, as a thing to be known and practised, progressive.

But you go on; "God has revealed himself, and all that he has spoken, and consequently all that is demanded of us, is declared in one book, from

“ from which nothing is to be retrenched, and to
 “ which nothing can be added.”

All this is most certainly true, and I rejoice from my heart, that I have at last found one sentence in your bulky volume, to which I can accede with full and free assent. But while I applaud your sentiment, I must condemn your practice, who have raised so alarming an outcry about a proposition, which confessedly makes no part of that “ one book.” You will say, you may interpret; really, Sir, I would grant that liberty to almost any man, rather than to you. Ever since you took it into your head to *assure* us, “ that the seven spirits are also God,” I have had some fears, that in your next publication, instead of a Trinity, you might set up a Decad of Gods, in order to accommodate your converts with a choice of objects, some of them *sensible* objects, of worship. But you must be allowed to interpret; for yourself alone then, and at your own peril, if your interpretation be influenced by any thing, but the love of truth. If you claim to interpret for me, I can find no such doctrine in your one authentic book, and I cannot know whether your interpretation may not “ add to, or retrench from” the meaning of the Holy Spirit, except you give me some convincing proof of your infallibility. Till then, your interpretation will be to me no part of that *one book*,
 which

which is my only rule, and where I find the direct contrary. If you force it upon me, that is, enact penalties for my disbelief, you force upon me what you cannot infallibly know to be contained in the book, and if you should happen to be mistaken (and it is as likely you should mistake as another man, over whose faith you thus set up a claim to domineer) you then make something a part of religion, which by your own confession ought not to be so accounted, nay, which ought to be rejected as unauthorized by your rule. Thus, by your own confession, your favourite proposition is by no means a necessary part of the Christian faith, nor ought to be indiscriminately bound upon every man. It may farther be worth your while to consider, how you can be certain, how any man can possibly be certain, that every word and syllable of that mighty heterogeneous mass, which passes under the name of Creeds, Articles, and Rubrics, which you have undertaken to defend, and in which the proportion of Scriptural propositions is infinitely small, is exactly consonant to that "one book," which contains "all that is demanded of us."

The wonders of this curious page seem to be inexhaustible. We are next told, that "all that *it* (the written word) contains was as perspicuous *to* those, who first perused it, after the rejection
" of

“ of the Papal yoke, as it can be to us now, or as
 “ it can be to our posterity in the fiftieth gene-
 “ ration.”

If this be so, it must be our own fault, and we have a sad account to make with regard to the ill improvement of our vastly superior advantages. If our ancestors were unaffected by that prodigious mass of chilling prejudices, which the ungenial frost of a night of eight hundred or a thousand years had conglobated, they were more than men; and if the cheering light, which, since their times, has beamed upon us, has afforded us no new prospect, we are less. I am of opinion, however, that not even your orthodox brethren will thank you for the assertion; a large majority of them have accommodated the establishment to their own taste, by explanations and qualifications, which, it is well known, leave not even a shadow of the sense of the Reformers. If the establishment cannot stand without these perpetually new rough-castings, would it not be better to give it at once a thorough repair, to make it that very thing, “ from which nothing
 “ is to be retrenched, and to which nothing can be
 “ added?” These explainers and qualifiers seem not to be altogether of your opinion, who, if you mean any thing, must mean, that when a system of religion has been once established, it is at least
 superfluous

superfluous ever afterwards to examine it, or compare it with the original code, because the sense of that code " was as perspicuous to those, " who formed the first human establishment, as " it can be to their posterity in the fiftieth generation." This might do very well, if we were sure that the first establishers were infallible, and neither could nor would mistake the sense of Holy Scripture; and in that case the original records might as well have been all destroyed, when we were sure that we had the quintessence of them infallibly extracted, and that there could be no more for us to learn and profit by. Such a doctrine will not, I hope, find many abettors in this Protestant country, though, by a proper application at the Vatican, nothing less than a Cardinal's hat would probably be your reward.

Now, Sir, I must bid you adieu, though a retrospect of the whole subject would open a wide field for interesting reflections. I will only ask, is it not wonderful, that in this age, enlightened by the valuable discoveries of so many excellent men among our predecessors, any person should be found, who thinks himself well employed in endeavouring to put out the lights, which they had set up for our direction; and for this very purpose, adopts and maintains principles, which, if they had

T

not

not been exploded, Popery must at this day have been the public religion, and which, whenever they become general, will certainly introduce it? That so preposterous a Labourer should have found countenance and encouragement, as report informs us, among men of consequence in Church and State, whose particular duty calls them to watch over our civil and religious liberties, is still more amazing. But the least accountable thing of all is, that he who works at this odious forge, and seems, at all events, resolved to bind us in religious shackles, is said to have defended the civil rights of his native country, not only vigorously, but vehemently. Can any man persuade himself, that civil liberty will exist, where religion is slavery, where men must believe, not because truth and reason constrain them, but because stern authority commands? our comfort however is; that the means you have chosen to accomplish your purpose, will, with cool and thinking men, effectually defeat it. Your zeal for a falling system at one time prompts you to prop it with a straw; at another, when a refractory text has exhausted your patience, the boldness of your comment exceeds all bounds; you use the privilege *quidlibet audendi* in as great a latitude, as if you were treating a poetical, not a theological subject. But I forbear, I will not imitate

tate your example; I will neither exhibit you as
 "a melancholy spectacle," by ascribing to you a
 "foaming hydrophobia *," a frantic horror of
 the "living waters," nor by an awkward apo-
 strophe to any part of the furniture of your head †,
 set up to judge your conscience.

* Layman, page 175.

† See the Layman's apostrophe to a mitre, page 227.

NOTES.

T 2

N O T E S.

Then *σωματικῶς* will mean *collectively, in one aggregate sum*, page 61.

This interpretation is greatly confirmed by the following text of St. Paul; *Ὅτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμα ἴσμεν ἐν χριστῷ*, *So we being many are one body in Christ.* Rom. xii. 5. Where *σῶμα* must signify an aggregate of individuals, called *one body* on account of their common union and connection with Christ. In this sense the Latin word *Corpus* is most common in the best Classical authors; and in Longinus, Sect. 10. *ἐν τῷ σῶμα* means an aggregate of striking circumstances. This meaning of its derivative, *σωματικόν*, is indisputable, as will appear by every common Lexicon.

ἐχ' ἀρπαγμον ἤγησάτο, page 88.

That the purest Greek writers used similar language, to express an eager desire to possess one's self of something, and hold it to one's own profit or honour, appears from the following passage of Longinus. *Ὁ μὲν οὖν Τιμαῖος, ὡς ΦΩΡΙΟΥ τινος ἐφαπτομένος, ἐδὲ τὸ τοῦ Ξενοφῶνι τοῦ Ψυχροῦ κατέλαβεν.* Timæus, seizing it as a prize, quasi *furtivum aliquid* arripiens, left not Xenophon in possession even of this frigidity.

Longin. p. 13. Pearce's edition,

A LETTER

L E T T E R
TO THE
REV. MR. JOSEPH FISHER,
OF D R A X,
IN
Y O R K S H I R E;

BY THE AUTHOR OF THE REMARKS
ON THE L A Y M A N'S
"SCRIPTURAL CONFUTATION."

QUID EXEMPTA JUVAT SPINIS DE PLURIBUS UNA?
HORACE.

5



A L E T T E R, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

YOUR request that I should write to you "with Christian mildness and moderation," is most reasonable; and I will, as far as possible, give you satisfaction. Of this mildness and moderation you and I, as in other matters, may have different ideas; in that case the public must judge between us. To that impartial tribunal I also appeal against your accusation, that I have treated Mr. Burgh "ungenerously" in my Remarks. The words *levity*, *ridicule*, *scurrility*, *rancour*, and *abuse* are easily uttered, and, in some people's mouths, often mean no more, than a confession that they cannot answer an adversary's arguments. When an author comes before the public, he submits himself to the judgment of that public; and if he appears in ridiculous features and accoutrements, they will laugh, and no answerer can help it, except he would betray his own cause.

I can-

I cannot persuade myself that I have treated Mr. Burgh with the least ill-nature through my whole book, or made one reflection on his moral character. I have exhibited him indeed (and think *that* now needs no further proof) as under amazingly strong prejudices, yet writing from serious, but too hastily admitted, conviction, on a subject he very little understands. Put together all the charges of ungenerous treatment, which you have brought against me at your 68th and 69th pages, and to what do they amount? That I have called him a "thoughtless youth" and a "stripling;" that I have supposed that "probably the *old* (I said *good*) woman, who nursed him, had as much knowledge of his subject as himself;" that in one place I have said "now I will cry shame," and in another "represented him as likely to become the sport of malapert children in the streets *."

To charge the first, I reply, that it was the effect of a mere charitable disposition, and really makes for him the very best excuse that can be made for a writer, who intruded into a dispute, of which he has a very slender knowledge, who calls himself a "young man," and manages such wea-

* This is not fairly represented. I said, "if he publicly held this sort of language," viz. put *Son* for *Father* in his common conversation.

pons as he has with the unhandiness of a recruit. For the second, himself informs us, that he had sucked in his Athanasian notions with his "nurse's milk," and has not, in his whole book, produced a better reason for embracing them, though many why he ought not. For the third, the expression was properly suggested by the occasion, and I will use it again of him, or of any other man, who shall attempt to persuade us, that an inspired Apostle could give a solemn benediction to the churches of Christ, in words to this effect, "Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from Jesus Christ, and from Jesus Christ." With regard to the last, it is a foolish fling enough, and you may censure it as much as you please, provided you act fairly between us, and pass a censure on Mr. Burgh severer in proportion, as he has treated Mr. Lindsey and others with less reserve.

— Quiescant porro, moneo, et desinant
Maledicere, malefacta ne noscant sua.

In fact, all this is simple rose-water and milk, in comparison of that *mera ærugo*, that *succus nigræ loliginis*, that caustic Alkali, which he has thought himself authorized to administer. Not to insist that he has represented Mr. Lindsey as a poor creature, who may not without *vanity*, think himself in the least degree a judge of spiritual things, as a

childish objector; as a dangerous sectary, if he had not diminished his own importance, by becoming the advocate of his own tenets; as a writer perfectly harmless, who had studied almost all books on the subject, but the one he ought to have studied, as neglecting the uncorrupted word, and adopting the doctrine of *filly* men and women*; not to mention, that in order to come at one of his favourite conclusions, he has accused St. Paul of using *awkward* language†, and the most palpable falsehood of his assertion, that Mr. Lindsey has not once appealed to his own criterion, Holy Scripture; that he calls him a Linnæus in Divinity, and accuses him of having recourse to as very an electioneering trick, as ever was played at Brentford; not to tire the reader by an enumeration of numberless other contemptuous titles, which he has bestowed without shame or remorse, he will surely be allowed to approach pretty nearly to scurrility, or even rancour, when he ascribes to Mr. Lindsey the depth of *stupidity* as well as *impiety*.

By this time, Sir, you may begin to perceive, that if I had been inclined to bandy Billingsgate,

* "Ten Dutch women, who suffered for Anabaptism," whose authority is all in all, with Mr. Lindsey, in comparison of which "the authority of the Scriptures will signify but little." Layman, page 6. To save trouble I have not quoted the Layman's book for these particulars, but make myself answerable, that he is fairly represented.

† See Acts xxii. 4.

here

here was plenty of provocation, and a plentiful stock of foul materials provided to my hand: But I committed myself only with his reasoning, and cared not how much he might be thought my superior in reviling. In the latter his fund seems to be inexhaustible, and you must hear him talk in a yet more exalted stile. At page 1st, he seems to have been privy to Mr. Lindsey's inmost thoughts, and positively assures us, that his "design was to degrade the God of our salvation, to snatch from us the object of our religion;" and at page 80, by a foolish dilemma, he lays us under the necessity of pronouncing both Dr. Clark, and Mr. Lindsey "guilty of an *impious* and absurd *blasphemy*."

I could wish to wade no farther in this sink, but alas, Sir, there is still much more to follow. Whoever shall read the first page of his fourth chapter, where he describes Mr. Lindsey's impatience of the service of Jesus Christ, will not suppose that he has before him the portrait of the mildest and meekest man, but of the wild bull dragging Dirce, of whose efforts to disengage himself the Poet * says, "The dame, the rock, the oak were drag'd along." Here are his own words. "He (Mr. Lindsey) bends so reluctantly under the easy yoke, the

* Euripides in Longinus.

“ light burden of the gospel; he so boisterously dashes about the bonds of peace, and so fretfully endeavours to cast the cords from him.” What a terrible thing, if any honest man should come within the whirl of one of his fetters! But even this is not all the danger. In the very same sentence we have the poor Apologist again under the metaphor of a mad dog; “ flying with such a foaming *hydrophobia* from the fountains of living waters, that he is really become a very melancholy spectacle.”

All this I passed over in my Remarks, and really thought myself intitled to some thanks from the Layman's admirers. Perhaps you now repent that ever you mentioned “ rancour and scurrility;” but I must not stop here. These are comparatively but harmless flowers of his eloquence. Let him say, if his conscience will allow him, that he had not a particular character in view, when he wrote his 227th page. Let him tell us to whom he imputes “ the damnable doctrine of doing evil, that good may come of it,” to whom he assigns that “ mitre, the symbol of a *double tongue*, that is to sanctify *duplicity* and *prevarication*; which is to be a *sanction* for uttering *two languages*, for telling a *lie* for the sake of telling *truth*; for entering into terms for the purpose of infringing them.”

Let

Let him name the object of all that virulence and venom, that tosses and foams through the whole of this, if it had an object, malignant apostrophe. To whom does he so magisterially call, as if constituted judge of the human heart, "to descend" from his *throne*, to place the *mitre* upon other brows, and to put upon his own the helmet of "salvation." Will he say that this was the involuntary explosion of an overcharged spleen? If it was not, and you think him blameless, then I am the man who am "ungenerously" treated, and must say,

"Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas."

JUVEN.

Thus much in vindication of my treatment of Mr. Burgh, who, by the bye, at the time the Remarks were written and in the press, was a nameless author; I come now to your Remarks, and begin at page 10. You there charge me with misrepresenting the Layman's meaning with regard to the impotence of reason to judge of the nature of God. The passage I had particularly in view, though I might have referred to almost every period in that strange chapter, was this; "The infinite and incomprehensible majesty of God is an object *beyond the limits of reason*; we are incapable of forming *any* idea of him; and consequently,

“ quently, from *whatsoever* ultimate maxims reason
 “ may proceed with relation to Scripture truth,
 “ she is debarred of *any* appeal to God himself, or
 “ to *any* imagination she may conceive herself able
 “ to entertain of him.”

No theorem can be expressed in more universal terms; in terms, which more absolutely take in every supposable case, if the words *not any* so often repeated be equivalent to the word *none*; and therefore every appeal to reason is utterly precluded. I conceived him to mean as follows, “ that in
 “ matters relating to the nature of God, man can
 “ have no information from his reason; that it
 “ will here stand him in no kind of stead; that all
 “ propositions of this kind are, with respect to
 “ man’s understanding, in themselves equally probable and true *.”

If any man can translate the Layman’s words into other English, I own he understands his language better than I do. You, Sir, seem to have been a little suspicious of the justness of your own remark, because you very opportunely break off your quotation at the end of the first member of the sentence, before you come to his strongest words, the very words from which I made my conclusion. If

* Remarks page 3, 4.

this be the true, the only sense of which his words are capable, I cannot help thinking it a very fair inference, that he has adopted a doctrine, which, if it be "admitted will throw the gates of our " Church wide open to receive transubstantiation, " and all the abominations of idolatrous worship."

At page 12 of your Remarks, instead of my word *reason* you substitute "the wisdom of this " world," which I can by no means admit to be an equivalent term. The terms are indeed so far from being equivalent, that, in my understanding, language affords not terms more directly contradictory. I suspected from the first, that your idea of *Christian* moderation might be different from mine, but this transmutation of my term into its direct contrary, if it were intentional; is, I think, not reconcilable even with *Pagan* honesty. I will not however impute to you intentional misrepresentation; if you really thought, that the English word *reason* is but another term for what the Apostle calls *the wisdom of this world*, ignorance, not dishonesty, accounts for the confusion of the terms.

Having however, in whatever way palmed upon your reader your term "the wisdom of this world," instead of my term "*reason*," you represent me as saying, that this *same wisdom of the world* is "in-
" fallible

“ fallible, and a proper judge of the matter,
 “ whether its object be the nature of God, or the
 “ nature of man.” My assertion, which, while
 God shall graciously grant me the use of reason, I
 will maintain, is this; “ So far as reason has clear,
 “ distinct, and adequate conceptions, so far its de-
 “ cisions are infallible; and it makes no difference,
 “ whether its object be things earthly, or things
 “ heavenly; the nature of God or the nature of
 “ man *.”

At your 16th page, you again most grossly misre-
 present my meaning: For there you charge me with
 saying, that “ reason concludes with intuitive cer-
 “ tainty,” without any limitation whatsoever,
 This would be understood by a person who has not
 read my book, as if I had made reason an infallible
 judge in all cases whatsoever; an imputation which
 I cast from me with abhorrence, and which, I
 hope, I shall never be wicked or foolish enough to
 deserve. You oblige me therefore to make another
 quotation from my own book, that is, to serve up
 to the public a *crambe repetita*, not a whit more pa-
 latable to my own taste, than to theirs. The pas-
 sage, from which this obnoxious expression is se-
 lected, is legibly printed as follows, and is not only
 perfectly harmless, but most infallibly true; “ When

* Remarks on Burgh, page 5.

" it is once known, that the Supreme God is un-
 " derived and self-existent, holding all his attri-
 " butes by the necessity of his nature, and not at
 " the pleasure of any other; *reason concludes with*
 " *intuitive certainty*, that whoever is not underived
 " and self-existent, whoever receives his attributes
 " from, and holds them at the pleasure of another,
 " is not Supreme God *." Dare you say that
 Euclid has more infallibly demonstrated the equality
 of the three angles of a rectilineal triangle to two
 right ones?

Presently after, you say, " What a presumptuous
 " question must that be then, which you ask in
 " your ninth page!" " Shall I renounce the clearer,
 " and be guided by the darker evidence?" " Where
 " by the clearer evidence you mean reason, by the
 " darker, revelation, as is plain to any one who
 " reads the passage," It is so; and, I think, it is
 equally plain to every human creature that can read
 the passage, save and except only the Rev. Mr.
 Joseph Fisher of Drax, that there is no presump-
 tion in it.

The evidence of reason, in the case in question,
 is supreme and infallible, which cannot possibly de-
 ceive. The evidence, on which we, in this age,

* Remarks on Burgh, page 6.

admit revelation, is human testimony: For by it alone we can know, that any revelation was ever made. But human testimony is not infallible, nor can afford absolute certainty. It may be strong enough, particularly if corroborated by the accomplishment of foretold events, to raise an exceedingly high degree of belief and conviction; but belief is not knowledge, nor equal to it, except it depend on the immediate testimony of God, who is infallible. It cannot therefore be so certain *à posteriori* that any revelation was ever made, as it is certain *à priori*, that "three perfect Gods are not one perfect God *." And if I should admit the latter proposition on the authority of a revelation, depending originally on the evidence of human testimony, in contradiction to what reason makes me know and feel to be true, I would prefer the darker to the clearer evidence, a less assured to a more assured gift of God.

I have thanked God that I find no such proposition expressed, or implied, from the first to the last

* The degree of evidence we have for the truth of revelation, to speak my sentiments fully of it, approaches very nearly to the evidence of demonstration. It affords me a conviction equal to what I have, that the sun will set this evening, and rise to-morrow morning; yet I have not intuitive, or demonstrative, that is, the highest evidence of any of these things, such as I have that *three* cannot be *one*.

chapter of revelation; and you ask, (page 17)
 " Pray, Sir, what do you thank God for?" Be-
 cause you " imagine you have found him revealing
 " himself according to your notion of things?"
 No, Sir, I thank God for revealing himself accord-
 ing to his own nature, and consistently with those
 truths, which he had infallibly taught me before;
 which if he had not done, I could have had no re-
 velation at all, nor ever have received information
 of those other most important truths, which my
 reason was unable to discover: For God, who is a
 God of truth, cannot contradict himself:

Thus, Sir, you have laboured in vain to take
 from me my principles, those principles on which
 my whole argumentation is grounded, on which
 all true religion must be built, such a religion as is
 alone fit for a God of truth to reveal, and man,
 endowed with reason, to admit. If you had made
 this attempt fairly, without changing or suppressing
 my words, and depraving my sense, I should have
 thought you a weak, perhaps a bigotted man; and
 you will perhaps call it a breach of " Christian
 " moderation," when I tell you that you are not a
 cunning man, if you supposed that all this would
 pass off without reproof.

When I, for the best reason in the world, called
 the Layman a " thoughtless youth and a stripling,"

the mouth of a party was opened against me; it was echoed in every ear, that "scurrility and "abuse" were the whole contents of a book, which, I am persuaded, contains much serious argument, which, I trust, unprejudiced Christians will not think unworthy of an attentive perusal. But that cool and deliberate dissingenuity (for time and thought were necessary to dismember my periods, and detach from them so much as might exhibit me as a fool or a sceptic) what name will you give it? Surely it is not unchristian, that I permit you to estimate your own criminality, and if you have any ingenuity remaining, you will see the difference between my conduct and your's.

Having done this justice to myself, and the cause in which I am embarked, the cause of genuine Gospel-Christianity, in noticing the remainder of your remarks I shall be very brief, leaving the much greater part of them to be carried the way of all mortal writings, by their own internal principles of decay. This, as matters stand among us, you ought to accept as no ordinary favour. The Layman had not patience till Mr. Lindsey's "flimsy" book "gradually subsided in its *congenial oblivion*," * but sent forth his own still-born performance

* "As a sectary then, I think he would be a dangerous man, "had he not himself diminished his importance, by becoming
"the

performance to kick it " more expeditiously from
 " existence." I will be more merciful to you, and
 if the pages uncriticised by me can live, let them
 live.

Pages

" the advocate of his own tenets; for as a writer, I consider
 " him to be *perfectly harmless*; yet still from that character, in
 " which I shall from henceforward address him, I dread the
 " schismatick, and have therefore opposed myself to a book,
 " which had it not come from the self-denying hand of this
 " Gentleman, might, for me, have gradually subsided in its
 " congenial oblivion. His conduct however might support it
 " for a time; my effort therefore is more *expeditiously* to dis-
 " miss it from existence." Layman, page 226. What a wise
 effort was this of our Layman, and for how important a pur-
 pose exerted; to put himself in so violent a sweat in order to
 " dismiss *more expeditiously*" from existence a book, which was
gradually subsiding in congenial oblivion, and which, even
 while it could hold its head above water, was *perfectly harmless*.
 The danger was in the schismatick, not in his *harmless* book;
 if therefore he would have removed the danger, he ought to
 have stillettoed Mr. Lindsey, and left his book to have flound-
 ered like a drowning puppy, as long as it could, in the slough of
 oblivion. But we must observe farther, that Mr. Lindsey
 ceased to be a dangerous sectary by the publication of his book,
 yet still he continued to be the object of dread to our Layman as
 a schismatic, *i. e.* as a sectary. It would seem that the Layman
 both fears and not fears at the same time.

At the page immediately preceding, we read, " a deadly
 " poison has been administered to the public, I have hastened to
 " prepare

Pages 18 and 20. "Neither the text of John
 " xvii. 3. — that they might know thee the *only*
 " *true* God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,
 " nor the text of St. Paul, 1 Cor. viii. 5. — yet to
 " us there is but *one God the Father*, and *one Lord*
 " *Jesus Christ*, exclude the Son by name from being
 " (the one true) God." Why? "Because, in the
 " former it is not said, *and Jesus Christ whom thou*
 " *hast sent, who is not the true God*; and in the latter
 " the words *God* and *Lord* are synonymous."

Really, Sir, you surprize me. Suppose one
 should say the Rev. Mr. Joseph Fisher was the *only*
 author of his own Remarks in defence of the Lay-
 man's "Scriptural Confutation," would not this
 be sufficient to secure the honour and the praise to
 yourself *alone*, without adding—and the Layman
 wrote them not? Again; if the words *God* and
Lord in the latter text be synonymous, then it
 might as well have been thus expressed, "yet to
 " us there is but *one God, the Father*, and *one God*,

" prepare the antidote, and have not paused to sugar over the
 " brim of the vessel in which I offer it to their lips." What
 was this *deadly poison*? Turn the page, and you find it was
 an innocent panada, which a sucking child might take with the
 greatest safety; a book composed by a writer *perfectly harmless*.
 If therefore the Layman was determined to force his *emetic*
 unnecessarily upon the public, he ought, in all reason, to have
 paused till he had made it as palatable as he could.

" *Jesus*

"Jesus Christ, who is not the Father, but the Father's Son." Strange interpretation! You will say, confute it. In very truth, Sir, I cannot confute it; "it presents no mark to the enemy;" it is safe in its own tenuity; shadow always was, and ever will be invulnerable.

"Irruat et frustra ferro diverberet umbras." Though I cannot confute it, I could "cry shame;" if you would not call it "unchristian;" or I could smile, if you would not call it "levity." I will for once, therefore, do neither, but leave it to the unprejudiced reader to do, as he shall find himself prompted by the nonsense.

Pages 22, 23. "Can it seem wonderful that "the divine wisdom opened and unfolded itself in "Jesus of Nazareth — only as necessity called for "it?" Yes, Sir, it does seem wonderful, if the two natures of Jesus Christ were but one person, that he knew not all things at all times. For the Supreme God is always the same, and knows not more at one time than at another. But "the Divinity, you say, unveiled itself by degrees, and "consequently in the time of his being here upon "earth, he might be ignorant of the day of judgment, or not have it revealed to him as man." Do you mean that the Divinity, which being united with the manhood of Jesus Christ made together with it *one person*, was something like Jezebel's

bel's God, who was sometimes *asleep*, and sometimes *on a journey*? Whatever you mean, I must tell you, as I have already told the Layman, that the question here is not about two natures, but about two persons. If you say that Jesus Christ had two persons, you formally contradict the Athanasian Creed; if you say he had but one person, you must then prove that *one* person did *not* know all, that the same *one* person *did* know.

You have not produced a single text by way of proving, that the personal pronouns, *I, thou, he*, applied to Jesus Christ, do not mean his whole person. I have the testimony of common sense for giving them that meaning, and the concurrent testimony of the whole race of men, who have used them in that meaning, in their almost momentary intercourse with each other, without a single exception from the beginning of the world to this day, if the case of our blessed Saviour be not an exception; and you have not a single *datum*, from which you can take one step towards proving that it is an exception, but the self-created necessity which you feel, that, you must either take this point for granted, or your system will be ruined, and, like a baseless fabric, tumble upon the head of the builder.

At

At page 23 of my Remarks, I had supposed a man indicted of perjury for falsifying in his evidence in a court of human justice, and "an honest jury to convict him, notwithstanding the miserable quibble, if he should dare to alledge it, that his flesh was really ignorant, though his reasonable soul knew well enough." The force of this illustration you think to repel, by observing that "a man is often indicted of murder, and an honest jury bring in a verdict of *manslaughter* or *chance-medley*," that is, they find that the death happened without the concurrence of the accused person's intention. Now, Sir, do you really believe, that, in giving a solemn evidence in a court of justice, any man's tongue ever uttered words without the concurrence of his intention, or that an honest jury could acquit a person indicted for falsifying in his evidence, on so ridiculous a plea? Would they not be justly indictable for perjury themselves, if they should find, that an innocent man, who had been executed upon such false evidence, died by chance-medley, in which the tongue of the false witness was the involuntary instrument?

At page 31 of your Remarks, you thus accuse me. "In order to *mislead* the unlearned, you have recourse to the original Greek, being

"sensible

“ sensible that the English translation is against
“ you.”

Indeed, Sir, you are egregiously mistaken, as those generally are, who depute themselves judges of other men's hearts. I had recourse to the original Greek (where every Christian who has a competent understanding of the language ought to study revelation) from a sincere desire to understand, and as far as I was able, to express the mind and will of God; which the English translation, as generally apprehended, I am certain by no means exhibits. This was my sole motive, and God, who knows my heart, will impute to me no other; and surely it is not your province, who are in utter ignorance of my intention, to judge me: You might have been contented to leave me to his sentence, who will acquit or condemn by the everlasting rules of truth and justice.

The text in question (viz. Rom. ix. 5.) I have discussed most seriously and calmly; and earnestly recommend an attentive perusal of my Remarks to all serious and unprejudiced Christians. Of the four reasons given by me for the probability of a small transposition, you have noticed but one, and this you have done in such a way, that scholars will inform you, that your own remarks and quotations prove your ignorance of the point on which
the

the argument turns, and consequently that you are no judge at all in the case. To shew you, however, that the Supreme Godhead of Jesus Christ cannot certainly be inferred from this text, I will here set down another literal translation of the original words, which, for the sake of brevity, was before suppressed. It is not possible for any thing to be more literal than what follows; *Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all viz. by the Father's appointment, who made him Lord and Christ, and sent him to bless us. God is to be blessed for ever, viz. for sending Jesus Christ to bless us.* You may say I have altered the punctuation; true; but the punctuation is a human thing, not found in the ancient manuscripts, which are written without any distinction of sentences or even words. Though we may not separate what *God hath joined together*, yet reason, and sense, and truth may require a separation of what was joined only by man.

Page 39 of your Remarks. "In him dwelleth
 "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Here
 again, say you, "you have recourse to the origi-
 "nal" (unpardonably audacious!) "and you tor-
 "ture your invention, by every means possible,
 "to put a sense upon the passage different from
 "what the Colossians, upon the reading of this
 "Epistle,

"Epistle, would take to be the meaning of St. Paul."

Really, Sir, if there was any torturing in the case it was over five and thirty years ago, when I was learning Greek. But, seeing you know so well what I endured in bringing forth this interpretation, you may the more reasonably be presumed to know, what sense the Colossians put upon the passage, when they first read the Epistle. For my part, I should have thought they would have put upon it, that, which was the plain, obvious, and original meaning of the words, and the meaning I have given to *πληρωμα* is its plain, obvious, and original meaning. To tell you a truth however, that criticism is to be understood only by those, who have made some progress, both in Grammar, and in the meaning of words. You seem to think that there are various texts, where this meaning will not suit. With regard to your first, John i. 16. it suits mighty well. I have not consulted those to which you only refer; but in your last, where you suppose it to make such wild work, it not only suits well, but is even necessary to restore sense to, I think, an unintelligible translation *. *God gave him to be head over all things to*

* This text in the common translation stands thus, *and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.*

the Church; which is his body, the *compleatment*, which he received from him, who is universally the compleater of all things, viz. from the Father. Eph. i. 23. A head, you must agree, is not a compleat whole, and the Father gave him the Church for his body, which rendered him compleat.

What the particular reason is, why you judge so wrong in these matters, I will not pretend to decide: Least of all, will I impute to you a wicked design of misleading the ignorant, which, with undoubtedly a true Christian spirit, you impute to me. There may be hindrances not in your own power to remove; but be the cause what it will, you certainly have as little understood my very serious discussion of St. Paul's text, Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8. The whole you have said upon this text is mere sophistry; if however it can stand, let it stand. I will only remind you, that there is one little word *Αλλα* (*but*) in the original, which while it stands there, will infallibly demonstrate, to unprejudiced men of real learning, the present translation of the former words to be inadmissible. From such men alone are we to expect a proper elucidation of difficult Scripture, and not from your *Country Counsellors**, who,

* "I often called to me some plain unlearned men, and read such passages, as I thought demonstrated him to be God, and then

who, however well-intentioned they may be, can judge only by a translation, which was made by honest men indeed, and in their age, learned men; but who wanted all that very considerable portion of light, which the labours of our worthy predecessors, orthodox and unorthodox, have reflected upon us.

At the beginning of your Postscript, you charitably inform me, that the word "Trinity" means "Three," and the word "Unity" means "One." Really, Sir, I knew this before, and rather wonder that you should think I did not, after reading my Remarks. I thank you however for your kind intention, and should have thanked you more, if you had directed me to any part of the whole Scriptures, where I could read, that "three are one." This proposition I cannot find for myself, and it seems hard to insist on my receiving as Scripture truth, what I cannot find, not even by implication, in any part of Scripture.

One would have supposed, from what you have written, that you were a sworn foe to a simile; nevertheless you seem to have been almost on the verge of a titter, when you played so prettily

"then asked what they thought the meaning was." Preface, page 5.

with

with my expression (page 35 of your Remarks) relating to Sir Isaac Newton's letter to Le Clerc *. For this I am not in the least angry with you, though I cannot think you have conformed exactly to Horace's rule, *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat*. The plain meaning of my expression is, that Sir Isaac Newton hath done all but give a *demonstration* of the forgery, that is, has afforded every degree of evidence, of which a matter, not strictly *demonstrable*, is capable.

At your 58th page, you again seem not to be quite serious, when you "beg of me to resolve" you this plain question; By what means did the "Trinitarian doctrine ever enter the mind of any man to conceive?" I think I could answer this question tolerably well, but perhaps you would

* If you could be prevailed with to read Sir Isaac Newton's two letters to Le Clerc, you would probably see sufficient reason, at least to suspect the authenticity of the word *Θεός* in St. Paul's text, 1 Tim. iii. 16. and absolutely to reject the 7th verse of John, Chap. v. Epistle 1st. See likewise Wetstein, on the former text, in his Prolegomena about the Alexandrian MS: on the latter, ad Locum; where you will see every argument you have advanced in its defence fully considered, and fully confuted. I take this opportunity to remark, that you might have done better, than choose for your motto two texts, of which the one is almost certainly corrupted; and neither can possibly have the meaning you force upon them, as has been an hundred times demonstrated.

not

not believe me. It is therefore better to put you in a capacity of becoming your own informer. When you have told me, by what means the notion of worshipping a *Breaden* God, Angels, Saints, and Images; of Purgatory; of an Universal Bishop, that is, of an Universal Tyrant, who was to ride the world at his pleasure; of Monckery and Nunnery; of burning Heretics and old women; of saying masses for the dead; of praying in a language not understood, with a thousand other fooleries and cruelties, the marks and effects of the grand Apostasy; when you tell me all this, then you will certainly know how the Trinitarian notion got footing. If so many horrid notions, most of which "reason decides with mathematical certainty to be false," and against which "Scripture pronounces with equal certainty," found their way into the Christian Church, why might not the Trinitarian doctrine find some door open, at which it might slip in?

At your last page, we have again something resembling the shadow of a joke: For there we read; "I have not the least doubt of the prodigious extent of your reading—since it plainly appears you have read the History of Patient Grizzle, and the History of the noted Giant-Killer; two books, which I think you would scarce have read with that attention you seem to have

" have done lately, by having them so fresh in
 " your memory, had you not before read, and
 " thoroughly considered most other books of great
 " er importance."

I assure you, Sir, that to the best of my recollection, I have read neither of these delectable Histories within the last five and forty years. But there are certain things which make a particular impression on my memory; and if I should live an hundred years to come, I do not believe I shall ever forget your extraordinary syllogism, page 53.

" There is no *Saviour* besides (the Supreme) God.

" Hosea xiii. 4.

" But Jesus Christ is Saviour. Titus iii. 6.

" Therefore Jesus Christ is (Supreme) God."

More goes to the making of a syllogism, than barely knowing there is to be a *major*, a *minor*, and a *consequence*. If the common term is not taken precisely in the same sense in both propositions, the conclusion is good for nothing. Now, whereas you take the term *Saviour* in its highest sense in your *major* proposition, if I should deny your *minor*, and say that Jesus Christ is not a *Saviour* in the same highest sense, I think I could demonstrate the negative in a very few words, and that you could not prove the affirmative in a volume of twice the

size of Mr. Burgh's, and mine, and your own put together. Jesus Christ is undoubtedly a Saviour; but he is a Saviour, *a horn of salvation*, whom the Father raised up in the house of his servant David; Luke i. 69. and never acted but under the acknowledged commission of him, who raised him up, and sent him.

“ I and my Father are one. From these words the Jews concluded, you say, (page 50) that they signified Jesus to be (Supreme) God, and he did not offer one word to undeceive them.”

It is true that the Jews maliciously put that interpretation, not, as it should seem, on these words, but upon his claiming to be the Son of God. I think however that you will retract your assertion, that “ Jesus did not offer one word to undeceive them,” when you have read, what perhaps it was not convenient for you to read before, the answer which he makes to this very charge. *If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, — Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?* John x. 35, 36. I conceive our Saviour's meaning to be this, “ If God himself gave the superior title of gods to magistrates and rulers, who acted in his name, surely there can be no blasphemy, if I, who have
in

" in a particular manner been sanctified and sent
 " by the Father, assume to myself an *inferior* title;
 " and call myself the *Son* of God. No man ever
 " accounted magistrates and rulers, though in the
 " Scripture stiled gods, to be each Supreme God;
 " why therefore should I be accused, with less rea-
 " son, of assuming Supreme Godhead to myself?"

" Could he (Clemens Romanus) have thus for-
 " mally distinguished God and Christ, if he had be-
 " lieved Christ to be God, in the highest sense of
 " the word?" To this question of mine you an-
 " swer (page 64.) " Yes, very well; as well as St.
 " Paul could distinguish God and our Father.
 " 1 Thess. iii. 11."

I think I shall not risk much, if I say perempto-
 rily, that St. Paul has not *formally*, nor at all, in
 this text distinguished God and our Father; and
 believe that even yourself will not venture to deny,
 that the true English of the Greek words (*Autos de o
 Theos kai pater hmeon*) is *our God and Father himself*,
 who is formally distinguished, by the words imme-
 diately following, from *Jesus Christ our Lord*; and
 consequently this very text is a direct proof that
 Jesus Christ is not our God and Father, as you
 affirm him to be, that is, God " in the highest
 " sense of the word."

At your 65th page we have this most extraordinary quotation from the same Clemens, "Through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and majesty for ever and ever. Amen." *

Having a little knowledge of the man and his communication, and not a little suspecting some misprision from your very slovenly and undecisive quotation, I took up the book, resolving, if possible, to find the place. The only passage, in which I could find the very words you have set down, is the conclusion of his 20th section; and the whole sentence, literally translated from the Greek, will run thus; *All these things, the great Creator and Sovereign of the universe, commanded to be in peace and concord, who conferreth all blessings, and upon us superabundantly, who have fled for refuge to his mercies, through Jesus Christ our Lord; to*

* You call this doxology a truly Scriptural one, and agreeable to St. Peter's, 2 Pet. iii. 18. Peter's words are, *Grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*: It is not quite certain that this is Peter's true text; there is, I think, not a little probability that it is not. After the words *Jesus Christ*, two manuscripts and the two Syriac versions, the former very ancient, add—*and of God the Father*. According to this reading the glory is ascribed to God the Father, and not to Jesus Christ, to whom, not *visibly* present, no doxology is made, I believe, in any other part of the Apostolic writings. Wetstein in Locum.

whom

whom be glory and majesty for ever and ever. Amen.

Now, Sir, do you really persuade yourself that glory and majesty is ascribed to the instrument and minister of the great Creator and Sovereign of the universe, and not to the great Creator and Sovereign himself, who conferreth all blessings through Jesus Christ? I appeal to your own heart, whether you think it probable, that the pious and grateful man should pour forth the warmest thankfulness to the minister, by whom the dispensation is made, and totally overlook the original cause and giver of all Good. Your heart will tell you, that it is most improbable; and I leave it to your conscience to decide, whether this maining of the venerable Father's sense was accidental or intentional. False dice may sometimes possibly fall into honest hands; and, when they do, he, who throws them, plays with infinite advantage against an antagonist not so fortunately provided. The putting your own sense on the doxology is perfectly blameless, but your reader ought to have been enabled to judge for himself by a full and fair citation of the context.

If the authority of Clemens is, as you say, but human, it is human authority invested with all the essentials of credibility, and fully competent for the purpose for which it is adduced, viz. to prove what the immediate successors of the Apostles had learned, concerning Jesus Christ, from their teach-
ing

ing and practice, Clemens has made the most formal distinction between God and Christ; and he who was a fellow-labourer with Paul; and whose name was written in the book of life*, could neither be ignorant of the doctrine and practice of the Apostles, nor have conceived a wicked design to mislead posterity.

When I speak of the testimony of Clemens, I mean only such as it is found in his first epistle, and before you quote the second, you ought to prove its authenticity, which, you can hardly be ignorant, is very greatly disputed.

I am surprized how ever it came into your head, to take me for the "Champion in heavy armour,"† as you seem to do at your last page. If you did it by way of flattering yourself with the hope of dying by a consequential arm, I am sorry to deprive you of that consolation; but in justice to the able writer, and generous friend of truth, who, under that ridiculously imposed character, sent a late puny Knight-errant to his long-home, I am obliged to declare that I am not the man. All the

* Phil. iv. 3.

† See the controversy, occasioned by Erasmus's illiberal attack on Mr. Lindsey, in the York Chronicle for the first three months of the year 1774.

imperfections,

imperfections, of whatsoever kind or degree, in the Remarks on Mr. Burgh's publication, are to be imputed to the pen of one, who never had the smallest connection with that respectable Gentleman. Seeing, however, you have been pleased to dress me out in these formidable accoutrements, I haste to put them off with all possible expedition, resolved never to wear them more in this cause.

"Hic cæstus pariter, artemque repono."

Now, Sir, I am to bid you farewell, and trust you will do me the justice to own that I have treated you with "Christian mildness and moderation." If I have failed in this respect, it was contrary to my intention, and ought to be imputed to the fate of controversy, which will always perhaps, more or less, put a writer off his guard. You say that you are sincerely desirous of coming at the truth; as a sincere enquirer, I esteem and respect you; and the more, because, I have been informed, that in your private character, you are an honest and good man. What a pity, if any thing has tempted you to swerve from this character in some parts of your address to me? Go on, Sir, to enquire; while you enquire there is hope. There was a time when your present correspondent was an Athanasian from conviction; but there never was a time, when his mind was
not

not open to fresh light and information. Without this indifference to every thing but truth; enquiry, however otherwise prudently conducted, will be vain. Love truth therefore, and love nothing else; and may the Spirit of Truth *dwell richly in our hearts in all wisdom*, in the heart of you and me, and every other serious Christian, and bring us all to the knowledge of all truth.

I am, with all brotherly affection,

Yours, &c,

APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

SINCE the preceding Letter was finished and nearly printed off, I have read Dr. Randolph's lately published "Vindication." Upon reading this Book, I suspected that Mr. Fisher had availed himself of the Doctor's materials, in two or three places; and particularly in the Doxology of Clements, which neither of them have exhibited fairly, though Mr. Fisher is the more blameable mangler of the two. I suspected likewise, that those "clouds of witnesses," with which my correspondent threatens to overwhelm me, from Ecclesiastical History, are such as the Doctor has prepared to his hands. It is not much worth the while to dispute upon this ground; because, after all, the question must be tried by another test: Otherwise I think it no hard matter to confront all the Doctor's testimonies, with passages from the same authors, that, in the most positive manner, assert the Son's inferiority to the Father. He has indeed produced few, if any; that necessarily imply an equality of three persons in the Godhead; but where people
are

are earnest to believe, a small degree of evidence is sufficient.

Est cuique Deus sua dira Cupido.

A small, or even, a great degree of prejudice however is sometimes excusable, because not always avoidable; but the Vindicator seems not to have been nicely scrupulous with regard to his authorities. What I have particularly in view, is the conclusion of Polycarp's prayer, as he exhibits it at his 94th page. For this he quotes the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, and tells us in his note that "no small part of this Epistle is recited by Eusebius. Eccles. Hist. l. 4. chap. 15." If he appealed to Eusebius to authenticate the Epistle, he acted very unwisely. For Eusebius gives us this prayer in words totally different from the Doctor's translation. I find indeed, by consulting the annotations on the passage in Eusebius, that there is a writing under the name of the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna; but some suspicious circumstances attended its introduction into the world in its present form. It had been, it seems, long lost; a certain Pionius, who greatly venerated the name of Polycarp, had searched for it diligently, but in vain. At last he had a *revelation* from Polycarp, where it might be found. He found it accordingly, but in a ruined condition, with evident marks upon it that it had been

been wrote on perishable materials. He made a shift however to transcribe it, and this transcript is what we now have. Supposing therefore the Doctor to have translated truly, he must bear to be informed, that the authority of this visionary is good for nothing against the grave authority of Eusebius, who appears to have quoted from a very different record. If the authenticity of the Epistle can be vindicated, his pen would have been better employed in such vindication, than in casting an imputation of *dotage* on such a man as Dr. Whitby, and expressing the most supercilious contempt of *one* Ben Mordecai, with whose learned and pious labours he appears to be utterly unacquainted.

Dr. Randolph says, the Martyr's prayer concluded thus, " I praise and glorify thee, with the
 " eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ thy beloved
 " Son, with whom to thee and the Holy Ghost;
 " be glory both now, and for evermore. Amen."
 According to Eusebius, he uttered not a single word, that seems not to imply his belief of the absolute supremacy of the Father. " Father, says he,
 " of Jesus Christ, thy beloved and blessed Son, by
 " whom we have received the knowledge of thee;
 " thou God of Angels and Powers, and of the
 " whole Creation, and of all the race of just men
 " who live before thee; I bless *Thee* that thou
 " thoughtest me worthy of this day and hour, to be
 " made

" made a partaker with the Martyrs of the cup of
 " Christ for the resurrection to eternal life both of
 " soul and body, of the never-failing support of the
 " Holy Spirit (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου); among
 " whom may I be accepted in thy sight as a rich
 " and acceptable sacrifice, according as thou the
 " true God, who canst not deceive, before declar-
 " ed'st, and hast fulfilled what thou pre-ordain-
 " ed'st: For this and for all things, I praise *thee*,
 " *I bless thee*, I glorify *thee*, through the everlasting
 " High-Priest Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son;
 " through whom to thee together with himself,
 " by the Holy Spirit, be glory now and for future
 " ages. Amen."

The Doctor's whole book affords much matter
 for reprehension; but I must not enlarge, and shall
 only offer a few remarks on his interpretation of
 our Saviour's expression, John xvi. 23. " In that
 " day ye shall ask me nothing. The word in the
 " original is ἐρωταεῖτε. The verb ἐρωτάω, though
 " sometimes it may signify *to petition*, yet in its
 " most common acceptation signifies *to interrogate*,
 " or ask a question. And that it signifies so here
 " is plain from what went before." Vindication,
 page 45.

The Doctor did wisely in allowing this verb some-
 times to signify *to petition*, and if he had not allowed
 it,

it, this very context, verse 26, would have confuted him. I will not deny, that in verse 23 it signifies "to interrogate, or ask a question," but do insist, that this is not its whole signification in that verse. If this meaning be necessary to connect the words with those that go before, the other meaning is equally necessary to form the connection with that which follows; and for this very reason a word of such latitude seems to have been chosen, and our Translators wisely rendered it by an English word of equal latitude, and which equally connects the sense. *In that day*, viz. when I shall be returned to the Father, and you no longer enjoy the benefit of my personal instructions, *ye shall ask ME nothing*, i. e. says the Doctor, "ye shall ask me no question," as ye just now desired to do. This might seem but a comfortless prospect to men, so long habituated to propose all their doubts to their beloved master, and to have them most condescendingly resolved; if something, which might answer all the ends of this endearing intercourse, was not to be substituted in its stead. What therefore should this be? Were they to avail themselves of the other meaning of the verb *ῥωτάω* and when they could no longer apply to him in person, make their doubts and difficulties known unto him by prayer? This the Doctor would have us to understand, and is most natural to suppose, if Jesus Christ had considered himself

in the same light, as the Athanasians of our times consider him. But no such matter: The remedy was most effectual, but of a different kind; they were to be no sufferers by his removal, but they were to explain their wants to another person. The words of our blessed Saviour, immediately following, are decisive. *Verily, verily I say unto you, I give you the most solemn and positive assurance, that, Whatsoever ye shall ask by prayer of the Father in my Name, He will give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my Name. Asked of Whom? Of the Father certainly. Ask—of whom again? indisputably of the Father—and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full, that you may be convinced that it is good for you that I go away. —At that day ye shall ask (the Father) by prayer in my Name, and I say not that I will pray (ἐρωτησω) the Father for you: For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.*

Will the Doctor deny that every part of this context marks, in the plainest manner, the person to whom, and the manner in which, prayer is to be addressed, and that Jesus Christ is not that person? If he do, I will not say that he is verging towards *dotage*; let that be the privileged language of Dr. Randolph, when he talks of a superior, whose arguments are too hard for his digestion;

gestion; but I will say, that he is at his last shift for a solution of the difficulty. When he can point out another passage of Scripture, which with equal plainness requires prayer to be addressed to the Son, I will own he has done something: But Scripture so plain and express, the words of Christ himself, cannot be set aside by a few passages of doubtful interpretation, and which may every one of them be understood consistently with this *.

* The verb *igraw* is used in the sense of *petitioning* at verse 26 of this chapter, and twice in the 9th verse of chap. 17, and likewise 1 John v. 16.

ERRATUM.

Page 154, line 5 from the bottom, for *I would prefer* read *I should prefer*.

10 FE 58

BOOKS printed for J. BELL, No. 132, Strand,
London, and C. ETHERINGTON, York.

The Substance of Lord CHESTERFIELD's Letters,
which at present form the Conversation amongst
all polite Companies, is now comprized in a small
elegant Volume, dedicated, by Permission, to the
Right Hon. Lord Viscount LIGONIER,

And is this Day published, price 2 s. 6 d.

Principles of POLITENESS,

By the late Lord CHESTERFIELD.
Methodized and digested under distinct Heads, with
Additions.

By the Rev. Dr. JOHN TRUSLER.

CONTAINING,

Every Instruction necessary to complete the Gentle-
man and Man of Fashion, to teach him a Knowledge
of Life, and make him well received in all Compa-
nies, for the Improvement of Youth, yet not be-
neath the Attention of any one.

A Second PART of the same Book is just published,
price 2 s.

HENRY the SECOND; OR,

The FALL of ROSAMOND.

By THOMAS HULL.

The FIFTH EDITION.

Ornamented with a beautiful engraved Vignette, re-
presenting the beauteous Rosamond falling a Sacri-

p[®]
fice to the Vengeance of the injured Queen. En-
graved from an original Design, made on Purpose
for this interesting Subject. Price 1 s. 6 d.

R E M A R K S
O N

Mr. THOMAS HENRY's

Improved Method of preparing

M A G N E S I A A L B A.

With an easy chemical Process of procuring it in the
utmost Perfection, without leaving any gritty Re-
mainder.

To which is added,

An A P P E N D I X.

By a P H Y S I C I A N.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

An E A S Y W A Y to prolong L I F E,

Being a Chemical Analysis, or an Enquiry into the
Nature and Properties of all Kinds of Food, how far
they are wholesome and agree with different Con-
stitutions. Written so as to be intelligent to every
Capacity.

By a M E D I C A L G E N T L E M A N.

Price Two Shillings.

The F O U R T H E D I T I O N.

Also, the Second PART. Containing many salutary
Observations on Exercise, Sleep, Drinking, Smoak-
ing, Bleeding, Dram-drinking, and the Utility of
taking Physic in the Spring.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

The THIRD EDITION.

T H E

GENTLEMAN's and LADY's POCKET COM-
PANION in the GARDEN,

Or a Calendar, pointing out what should be done
every Month in the Green-house, Flower, Fruit,
and Kitchen-garden, with the proper Seasons for
sowing, planting, &c. so as to have a regular Suc-
cession of Flowers and Vegetables throughout the
Year.

To which is added,

A compleat LIST of the Flowers that blow each
Month.

Though of so small a Size, no one Thing is omitted.

Price One Shilling.

Neatly printed, no bigger than a Pocket Almanack.

N. B. With the Help of this Book, Gentlemen
may instruct any Country Servant to look after a
small Piece of Ground, at a very little Expence, make
that Ground go a great Way, and supply their Tables
with every Thing in Season. It will enable the Ladies
also to dispose their Flowers to the best Advantage,
and procure a general Bloom throughout the Year.

THE O E C O N O M I S T,

Shewing in a Variety of Estimates from 80l. a Year to upwards of 800l. how comfortably and genteely a Family may live with Frugality, for a little Money;

Together with the Cheapest Method of keeping
H O R S E S.

Note. An Attention to these Estimates will infallibly tend to the Comfort and Happiness of Thousands, as they will teach the Reader how to make a Little go a great Way, and shew him what Expences he may enter into consistent with his Fortune and Situation in Life.

Price One Shilling.

The NINTH EDITION.

TEN MINUTES ADVICE

TO EVERY

G E N T L E M A N

Going to purchase a HORSE out of a Dealer, Jockey, or Groom's Stables, in which are laid down established Rules for discovering the Perfections and Blemishes of that noble Animal.

Price One Shilling.

BELL'S EDITION
OF THE
Gentleman's Pocket Farrier,

Shewing how to use your Horse on a Journey,
and what Remedies are proper for common Ac-
cidents that may befall him on the Road.

Price One Shilling.

Neatly printed on thin Post Paper, very small Size,
on purpose to lay in a Pocket Book.

This little Tract has been in great Estimation for
these Fifty Years past, and has gone through many
Editions in Ireland. The Remedies it prescribes are
simple and easily obtained, and never fail of a Cure,
where the Disorder is Curable, and no Man who
values his Horse should presume to travel with-
out it.

N. B. Be careful to ask for BELL's Edition of
this useful little Book, as the extraordinary Encourage-
ment it daily experiences, has excited the Envy of
some other Booksellers, who have descended so very
low as to copy the Title of it nearly Verbatim, with
a Pretence of giving some other USELESS Additions,
in order to obtrude with more Facility their own
Trumpery, when this useful Treatise may be wanted.

THE FRIENDS;
OR,
Original LETTERS of a Person, deceased;
Now First Published from the Manuscript in his Cor-
respondent's Hands.
In TWO VOLUMES.
Price Six Shillings, bound.

B E L L ' s E D I T I O N
O F
S H A K E S P E A R E ' s W O R K S ,

~ C O M P L E A T ,
I N C L U D I N G H I S P O E M S .

P R I C E S .

	£.	s.	d.
On large Royal Paper, in 9 vols. sewed,	1	18	0
On Demy Paper, — in 9 vols. sewed,	1	7	0

The C O N T I N U A T I O N ,

To complete the First Five Volumes.

P R I C E S .

10 EE 58

	£.	s.	d.
On large Royal Paper, in 4 vols. sewed,	0	17	0
On Demy Paper, — in 4 vols. sewed,	0	12	0

A few prime Impressions of the complete Set of Prints, consisting of 41 striking Dramatic Subjects, including the much-admired Likeness of the Author, and of David Garrick, Esq; are preserved on Proof Paper, and will be sold for Cabinet Furniture, or to bind up with any other Editions,

At One Guinea and a Half per Set.

N

KS,

d.

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o